

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHAME AND ANGER:

A CASE STUDY ANALYSIS

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the Degree
of
Master of Science in Psychology
in the
University of Canterbury

By

Michael Francis Wall

University of Canterbury

2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	3
ABSTRACT	4
CHAPTER ONE	5
INTRODUCTION	5
<i>Definition of Shame</i>	8
<i>Functions of Shame</i>	13
<i>Shame-proneness</i>	15
<i>The Self</i>	16
<i>Anger</i>	19
THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON SHAME-ANGER	20
<i>Cognitive-Affective Theory</i>	21
<i>Self-Psychology Theory</i>	23
<i>Nathanson and Affect Theory</i>	25
<i>Design</i>	29
METHOD SECTION	30
<i>Pilot Study</i>	30
<i>Participants</i>	30
<i>Materials and Procedure</i>	32
<i>Transcription</i>	34
<i>Analysis</i>	35
<i>Cases and Coding</i>	35
<i>Analysis of Cases</i>	37
<i>Within Group Analysis</i>	38
CHAPTER TWO	41
CASE STUDY #1: ANTHONY	41
CASE STUDY # 2: ANDREW	55
CASE STUDY #3: ALBERT	67
CASE STUDY #4: ASHLEY	79
CASE STUDY # 5: ARTHUR	92
CASE STUDY #6: ANTON	105
CASE STUDY # 7: ANGUS	119
CASE STUDY#8: NOEL	131
CASE STUDY #9: NORMAN	142
CASE STUDY #10: NIGEL	152
CASE STUDY # 11: NEIL	163
CASE STUDY # 12: NEVILLE	173
CASE STUDY # 13: NATHAN	185

CHAPTER THREE..... 196

ANALYSIS 196

Defining Shaming 197

Defining Shame..... 197

Family Context 201

Parental Status 202

Relationship Quality - Parents 202

Participants Relationship to Parents..... 203

Family Origins of Shame..... 205

Shaming outside the Family 210

Patterns of Anger..... 211

Shame and Anger Interaction Themes..... 217

Coping and Shame Modulation Themes..... 231

DISCUSSION 236

 Conclusion..... 247

 Bibliography..... 251

 Appendix 254

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my heartfelt gratitude to my wife Susi, whose incredible patience, understanding and encouragement has enabled me to put more into this project than would have otherwise been possible. A special thanks also for her input into the reading of drafts, and for her tireless support throughout the last two years. Another debt of gratitude goes to my brother John for his encouragement, ideas and for his untiring involvement in the reading of several very long draft copies of this manuscript. His support is very much appreciated.

Also, I wish to thank my supervisor Professor Ken Strongman for his guidance, patience and tolerance, of which large quantities were required. Special thanks also to Will and Jude for their input into the search for participants for this study.

Finally I would like to express my gratitude to all of the participants, who gave their time, and had the faith and courage to share with a stranger the most private aspects of themselves. It is this aspect of the study which will endure as the most rewarding for myself. It is also hoped that some reward is felt by the people whose stories occupy the following pages.

Abstract

This study explored the relationship between shame and anger in high anger males (n=7, mean age, 39 years), and non-angry males (n=6, mean age, 42years). It was found that shame and anger form a dynamic relationship, which is affected by both biological and environmental factors. Across both groups, being shamed as an adult was found to lead to anger. However, shaming situations appeared to mean different things for both groups. For the study group, shame was a threat to their authority and status, and for the control group, shaming resulted from threats to democratic aspects of relationships (equality, mutual respect). For the study group, adult shame was associated more with negative judgment by others, and for the control group, shame was more likely to be associated with one's own judgment of the self.

For both groups, experiences of shame affect resulted from attributions of self-responsibility for transgressions. Where self-responsibility was not acknowledged, no shame reported to be experienced. Childhood shame was generally associated with the emotions of fear and distress, and not with anger. Where anger was present in childhood, it was associated with severe and intense shaming. Adolescent/young adult anger was related to shame in two distinct levels: blame and proving oneself. Both of these tendencies tapered off around the beginning of middle adulthood. Two factors were prominent in this pattern: maturation (mellowing, slowing down) and forgiveness.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Both anger and shame are universally felt human emotions. There has been a great deal of study done on both of them separately, with shame attracting a lot of attention in the last two decades (Gilbert, in Gilbert & Andrews, 1998). Anger is generally seen as a primary emotion that energizes the organism, and assists in goal directed behavior (Lazarus, 1992). In this context it is seen as an instrumental emotion (Nathanson, 1992). Shame is generally seen as having the opposite effect, in that it is associated with shutting the organism down both physiologically and mentally (Miller, 1996). Despite seemingly opposite tendencies, links between these two powerful emotions have been made both empirically and theoretically.

In the following, three levels of requisite information will be laid out to orient the reader to the nature of the study. First, some of the key theoretical and research issues will be outlined to familiarize the reader with some of the central issue involved in the study of shame-anger. The aims of the study will then be outlined. A description of methodology will follow.

The global orientation of this study is towards an understanding of the enduring and often destructive nature of anger, specifically that of males. The social cost of destructive

anger is high, as can be witnessed any day of the week on the television and in the newspaper. It is therefore critically important to understand both antecedent processes, as well as those that are responsible for its perpetuation. This study aims to explore the psychology of anger as it relates to shame. Both anger and shame have been linked on the theoretical and the research level, and some of these linkages will be explored next.

In the 1970's, H.B. Lewis coined the term 'humiliated fury', which in essence views anger as part of a shame-humiliation experience (cited in Gilbert & Andrews, 1998, p. 7-8). In Lewis's conception of the relationship between shame and anger, anger is a response to the humiliation involved in the breaking of social bonds. The developmental psychologist Michael Lewis (1992) sees anger as a 'substitute' for shame. In this context, anger, whether directed at the self or outwardly, serves to dissipate painful feelings of shame (p. 151-152). Social psychology tends to see anger as a 'cover' for shame or a 'face saving strategy' (Averill, 1982, Archer, 1994, in Gilbert & Andrews, 1998). In this context anger is associated with maintaining one's honour in situations in which it is threatened. Affect theorists tend to see anger as a part of a shame modulating script (Nathanson, 1992). Anger in this context is used to elevate one's self-esteem by lowering that of others.

In all of these cases, shame or shaming precedes anger. However theorists such as H. B. Lewis also recognize that anger can lead to shame. Furthermore, this resultant shame can lead back to anger, a situation known as a 'feeling trap' or a 'shame-rage spiral' (in Lewis, 1992, p. 149-153). Gilbert (1998) points out that individuals for whom the over control of emotions is an issue are likely to be shamed by an outburst of anger.

There are many studies that posit a correlational relationship between shame and anger (e.g., Tangney, Wagner, Hill-Barlow, Marschall & Gramzow, 1996). Also within the clinical and psychotherapeutic setting, there is tacit approval of the idea that anger/rage develops from shame (Miller, W., 1993). This is especially true of self-psychology and associated therapies. Even though there is wide acceptance that there is a relationship between shame and anger, very little empirical research has been done to explore the nature of this relationship. Related theory is often based on anecdotal and clinical observation, in conjunction with child development studies concerned with the ontogenesis of emotion. In this sense, theory is often based on parallels between childhood behavior and adult behavior.

Like all developing theory, the findings from studies (probabilities – facts) are merged into inferential propositions and ideas. Shame-anger theory is, as yet, cohesive. As with many other new areas of exploration, theory on the current subject lacks the support and insight gained through the divergent methods of longitudinal and cross-cultural studies.

One's view of the nature of the relationship between shame and anger depends largely on the perspective taken on child development, emotion, development of the self, and epistemology. There are many differing perspectives, all of which emphasize different aspects of the developmental process, and therefore posit different reasons for the occurrence of phenomena.

The broad question that guides the current research is, does theory about the relationship between shame and anger reflect the structure and content of the said relationship in people's lives? Furthermore, does the variation in theory reflect diversity within the relationship between shame and anger in lives, or are the various theories or parts of theories simply describing the same thing using different language? Other questions which the study intends to address are: is a relationship between shame and anger locatable in people's lives, and if so is it stable over time? If not, does it fade in intensity over time or does it change configuration? Does shame-anger become shame-sadness/depression? What are the agents of change? Does it involve biological maturational processes, or is it socialization, or both?

One of the difficulties of studying shame is that of definition. Shame is theorized about, and studied on a variety of levels of human existence, from the cultural (Lewis, 1992; Scheff, 1997; Harre & Parrot, 1996), familial (Scheff, 1997), interpersonal and intrapersonal (Miller, 1996; Lewis, 1992; Nathanson, 1992; Tangney *et al.*, 1996; and others). Also, theorists from different theoretical orientations characterize shame in different terms. Thus it is important to clarify the way in which shame is defined theoretically, as well as how it will be defined in this study. These issues will be outlined in the following.

Definition of Shame

Shame is an extremely difficult emotion to define. Gilbert (1998) points out that shame can be defined in terms of a feeling, an emotion, its cognitions and beliefs, its behaviors and actions, evolutionary function and interrelationships (p. 4). It can also be seen as a state, trait or disposition. Shame is described by Tangney *et al.*, (Tangney, Miller, Flicker & Barlow, 1996 in Gilbert & Andrews, 1998) as being ‘characterized by devastating and paralyzing feelings of self-condemnation’, which might include ‘disgust, anger, and inferiority....’ This short definition above describes the feeling of shame, and points to what are perhaps the most important aspects of shame - that it is about a defect of the self. Shame can be seen in connection with both the whole self as globally flawed, or in relation to a single aspect of the self (Lewis, 1992). A person may be ashamed of their physical being (e.g. obesity), yet may be otherwise proud of him/her self. In either case, shame is triggered when this defect is exposed.

One of the problems facing shame researchers is the close resemblance of shame to other related emotions (Lewis, 1992). There is a great deal of literature dedicated to the differences between shame and guilt, and it is generally agreed that this is an important distinction. However, as yet, there is no universal agreement as to what exactly constitutes the difference between these two emotions, mainly because they are very likely to be triggered by the same or similar situations, and therefore occur as components of the same emotional experience (Nathanson, 1992). Another obstacle in separating shame and guilt is that lay people appear to use the terms interchangeably, and may label one as the other (Gilbert, in Gilbert & Andrews, 1998). Thus in lay language there is both little distinction between the two, and a lot of uncertainty as to what feeling the shame or guilt label is appropriately attached to. The following is a brief overview of the way in which guilt and embarrassment are construed within the shame literature.

Guilt, according to Tangney *et al.*, (1996) ‘...when experiencing guilt, a person’s focal concern is with a specific behavior or failure...’ involving negative evaluation, remorse and regret in relation to an act. Thus the feeling does not generalize to the global self, as with shame (p. 798). Lewis (1992) surmises, that the object of guilt is outside of us (e.g. an act), whereas with shame we are the objects of shame (p. 76). This difference is

reflected in self-statements for guilt; ‘what I did was bad’, and for shame; ‘that happened because I am bad’ (p. 76). Guilt comes with a ‘... press toward reparative action, such as apologizing, undoing, making good a wrong that was done (Tangney *et al.*, 1996; Lewis 1992). Another difference according to Lewis (1992) is that the feeling of guilt is less intense than shame and doesn’t shut down the person’s ability to function as is the case with shame. Behavioral signs of shame are, hunched shoulders, head down, eye gaze averted, and lack of verbal and physical action (Lewis 1992).

Lewis (1992) identifies two types of embarrassment. The first is similar to shyness and occurs when one is exposed to positive information such as a compliment (p. 81). It does not involve a negative evaluation of the self, but rather discomfort with being in the spotlight. The second type is more closely related to shame but is less intense (p. 82). This feeling involves a negative evaluation of the self but has to do with a failure in relation to less important, less central standards, rules and goals (Lewis 1992).

While many researchers see shame as a separate emotion from humiliation, embarrassment and guilt, some theorists are more inclusive in their approach. Nathanson (1992) draws on Tomkins’s (1995) affect theory, which posits eight basic affects, of which shame-humiliation is one. Affect theory will be outlined later in the introduction, but the aim now is to emphasize that Nathanson separates shame into two levels. They are shame as affect, and shame as emotion. Affect relates to the essence, or core quality of an emotion. There is only one shame affect, but there may be many different expressions of shame as emotion. One of these is humiliation, and one is embarrassment. According to this view, these emotions are all part of the ‘shame family’ of emotions (in Miller, 1996).

In the present study, a similarly broad conception of shame is used, but guilt and embarrassment will not be interpreted as shame. If a participant remarks that they were embarrassed or felt guilty in a particular situation, this data will not be used in the study. Nor will shame refer exclusively to the emotional state of shame, although this will be included as shame. The preferred conceptualization of shame is that used by Miller (1996), which emphasizes “the inclusion and prominence of ‘negative ideas about the self which exist in relation to standards rules and goals’ (p. 30). Within this framework, descriptors such as ‘low self-esteem, low self-worth, feeling bad about oneself, feeling inadequate, worthless, and unworthy, are all taken as expressions of shame within this study.

Furthermore, part of the aim of this study is to explore participants' understanding of shame. Therefore, shame will be viewed on two levels. At the analytical level the researcher will be guided by Miller's conceptualization (see above), and as well, participants will also explore what shame is for them. They will not be given theoretical definitions of shame by the researcher; rather, they will be encouraged to draw on their own understanding and conceptualization of shame. The discussion will briefly, turn to issues concerning the status of shame as an emotion, and as well, some of the main physiological correlates of shame will be outlined.

Shame: Primary or Secondary Emotion?

There is still debate over whether shame is a primary or secondary emotion. The term primary emotion connotes that the emotion is in-born as part of the innate apparatus (for example, Nathanson, (1992). In Nathanson's view, shame gives rise to other emotions such as guilt and embarrassment. In this sense, guilt and embarrassment are secondary to shame. Lewis (1992), in a re-conceptualization of the primary/secondary distinction, classes shame as a secondary emotion, not because it emerges from another prior emotion, but because it, and other emotions, form a natural group which have in common that they require a sense of self to exist. This sense of self (objective self-awareness) only emerges in the second year of life, and so for Lewis, shame is not possible before this time. The other emotions, which form the group known as self-conscious emotions, are, jealousy, envy, empathy, embarrassment, shame, pride and guilt (p. 19).

Physiology of Shame

The experience of shame is accompanied by certain characteristic physical/behavioral correlates. In shame, the eyes are averted and downcast, muscle tone is lost around the neck and shoulders, the shoulders are slumped and the head is lowered (Nathanson, 1992). In this sense shame interferes with the ability to maintain attention, and

to think clearly. Miller (1996) emphasizes the notion of disorganization of thought as central to the shame experience. Action tendencies associated with shame are, the desire to escape, disappear, hide, 'sink into the floor' (Tangney *et al.*, p. 798), and to use Darwin's term, to conceal (cited in Lewis 1992). The tendency toward concealment and secrecy is an aspect of shame that makes it very difficult to study (Gilbert, 1998).

Cognitive Dimension

According to Gilbert (1998), 'most shame theorists fall into the category of cognitive-affective theorists (p. 15). That is, 'shame is associated with particular types of appraisals, mostly of the self'. (p. 15-16). Theorists such as Lewis (1992), and Lazarus (1991), propose that cognition (appraisal) gives rise to emotion. However, Frijda (1993, in Gilbert & Andrews, 1998) points out that appraisal can occur before, during and after an emotion experience. In addition, 'preexisting beliefs (e.g., I am unlovable) may dispose a person to both the affect and the evaluation of situations (p. 16).

Whether one holds to cognition as pre or post-emotion, shame is characteristically associated with certain beliefs and cognitions. Nathanson uses eight categories of cognition. They are: 1) Matters of personal size, strength, ability and skill ("I am weak, incompetent, useless, weak")

2) Dependence/independence (Sense of helplessness)

3) Competition ("I am a loser")

4) Sense of self ("I am defective, bad, flawed")

5) Personal attractiveness ("I am ugly, repulsive, hideous etc")

6) Sexually ("there is something wrong with me sexually")

7) Issues of seeing and being seen (The urge to escape and not be seen by others)

8) Closeness issues (thoughts of separateness from 'humanity', isolation, alienation, "I cannot get close, I am unlovable") (p. 317).

For Nathanson (1992), these thoughts occur after shame affect has been triggered - as part of the reaction to shame affect (p. 316). Michael Lewis (1992) on the other hand

views these thoughts as causing shame (p. 65). Central to this view is the notion that thought processes trigger self-conscious emotions such as shame and pride. These processes are largely evaluative, and they deal with our behavior in relation to internally held 'standards, rules and goals' (p. 65). These standards, rules and goals are derived both from the social world (family, group, culture), and internally. What is constituted as success or failure in achieving goals, etc., varies from person to person, depending on socialization.

Theorists tend to see anger in the context of '...an irrational, defensive, response to real or imagined threats to the self' (Averill, 1982; Lewis, 1971; Lewis. M, 1992; Scheff, 1987; Tangney, 1990, cited in Tangney, *et al.*,1996). Tangney points out that the shame-prone person is likely to make biased assumptions 'of malicious intent on the part of others' causing exaggerated reactions often 'out of proportion to the reality of the situation' (p. 799). That is, the shame prone individual is hyper-sensitized to the potential of any situation to provoke shame in them, and is likely to view others as potential sources of shame.

According to Lewis (1992), shame is triggered by an attribution that failure is caused by a global negative attribution to the self for failure vis-à-vis standards, rules and goals (p. 75). That is, failure is attributed to the self as opposed to an external object, such as luck or fate. In this sense, the person takes responsibility for the failure. If one attributes success to a global attribute of the self, then one will feel 'hubris' (an enduring sense of pride). If however a person transgresses, and blames an outside source for his failure, then shame is unlikely to result (p. 69).

Lewis's developmentally based theory, allows for change (development) over time, which takes in the notion that qualities of emotional experience will vary, depending to a large extent at which developmental stage the person is at. In studies done on the nature of children's attributions, Lewis notes that young children are more likely than older children to attribute blame to themselves, and therefore to feel shame.

The contrasting views of Nathanson (1992) and Lewis (1992) have been described, because they represent two ways in which emotion may be generated. The former view supposes that shame is triggered by an outside stimulus, while the latter view sees shame as being triggered by thoughts (appraisal) about internal and/or external stimuli. The

question here is, is chronic shame-anger linked to outside stimuli or is it somehow internally generated, through thought? Is one approach more useful than the other, for trying to understand chronic anger? These issues will be explored in the current study.

Shame is a self-related emotion (Lewis, 1992). One cannot study the relationship between shame and anger without an understanding the self-system and how it functions, especially in relation to emotion. It is to this subject that we will now turn.

Functions of Shame

Authors, such as Scheff (1997), and Lewis (1992), view shame as serving both interpersonal and intrapersonal functions. In general, along with other emotions, shame tells us 'how we are in the world', how we feel about things, people, situations, and whether our behavior, thoughts, feelings, goals and beliefs are congruent with those around us (Lewis, 1992). Shame speaks to our deepest sense of self, as opposed to guilt, which is said to be oriented towards behavior and events. Intrapersonally, shame is often viewed as information about a negative aspect of the self, although some authors tend to see it only as a global negative attribution relating to the whole self (e.g., Lewis, 1992). An example of this is the statement, 'I am bad', or 'I am unlovable'.

But as mentioned elsewhere, shame can relate to an aspect of the self, for example, a person may be ashamed of a speech impediment or a club foot. This shame may only apply in specific situations, for example outside the home where self-consciousness is heightened. In this context, shame may be seen as a representation of an undesirable self against which the individual pushes in order to develop and strengthen other self-structures, such as will, and empathy (Saarni & Harris, 1989). Within human development, indeed shame is viewed as necessary and important for the building of both moral and efficacy-related structures, and in this way is both a social, and intrapersonal emotion (Scheff, 1997). That is, as a feeling, it can teach us from within that something is wrong, and it is also used by society to teach the wrongness of what we have done.

Within the framework of Tomkin's (1995) affect theory, shame has the special status of 'auxiliary affect'. That is, its function is to attenuate the positive affects of interest-excitement and enjoyment-joy, when their on-going activation is likely to bring the

organism into some kind of danger. Shame, in this sense, arrests the organism from seeking pleasure. In Nathanson's words, shame can 'interfere with anything on earth that we enjoy'. Miller (1996) describes this as a 'self-stopping' function, and there is no doubt that on a theoretical level, shame is associated with the inhibition of behavior and activity.

On a social level, shame is widely associated with the maintenance of social bonds (Gilbert & Andrews, 1998). According to Scheff (1997), shame is a signal that alerts us to a damaged social bond. It signals 'alienation in social interaction' (p. 200). For Tomkins (1995), shame is about deference, and punishment of the self, and is to do with keeping the peace by avoiding conflict (in Sapp, 1986, p. 245).

Many authors link these ideas with the maintenance of interpersonal and group bonds (Keltner & Harkner, in Gilbert & Andrews, 1998). In the view of these authors, shame fulfills an 'appeasement function', wherein shame results from moral or social transgression, which leaves the shamed person 'outside' the group (p. 80). Through the display of 'non-verbal' shame, the shamed person inspires sympathy in members, thus increasing his/her chances of re-admittance back into the group. These authors draw on animal studies as well as judgment studies in support of their ideas. These studies indicate that submissive behavior in animals resembles that of shame behavior in humans (p. 87). As already mentioned, the behavioral correlates of shame involve bowing the head, gaze aversion, and generally avoidant behavior. Cross-cultural studies also show that non-verbal displays of shame are recognizable by participants at above normal rates (p. 89).

The view of shame as an elicitor of sympathy and a modulator of aggression ties in with a vast array of media from the Bible to Shakespeare and to *The Virginian*. The script which goes something like, 'I've done wrong, I feel ashamed, please forgive me' is an integral part of the Western psyche; one might expect forgiveness if the shame was genuine (Lewis, 1992).

The question could be asked, what role does shame play in this context? Generally shame is associated with producing anger. It is very likely that under conditions of appeasement, it would have the opposite effect. The issue here is in which context does shame either produce or reduce anger? This of course is linked to the greater issue within which this study is embedded; that of how to reduce anger in high-anger individuals.

Shame-proneness

Are certain people more likely to experience shame in relation to potentially shaming events, than others? Shame-proneness is described by Tangney *et al.*, (1996) as a propensity to feel shame in potentially shame-eliciting situations (see also Gilbert & Andrews, 1998, p. 40). It is also referred to as 'sentiment of shame' (Tantum, 1998, p. 39), and various other descriptors. However called, it refers to a generalized and ongoing sense of or vulnerability to shame. Tangney *et al.*, (1996), have developed the idea that people will be either prone to shame or to guilt in relation to a pre-scripted scenario. The origins of shame-proneness are unclear, with a few researchers pointing to biological factors and the majority pointing to social factors.

Gilbert (in Gilbert & Andrews, 1998 p. 27) reviews literature by Zimbardo (1997), and Kagan (1994), which suggests a genetic link to shame proneness via shyness and behavioral inhibition respectively. However, Gilbert concludes there is no reliable evidence at this stage to support the idea of biology and shame-proneness.

Self psychologists (Miller, 1996) consider shame-proneness to originate in early infant-parent interaction, resulting when the child experiences ongoing disapproving messages from the parent (mirroring). These messages may come in different forms, but overall they seem to center on the child's needs being ignored and their efforts at communication going largely unanswered. In this sense the child's ego development is thwarted, and their sense of themselves in the world is characterized as unacknowledged or insignificant.

Other authors see shame-proneness as linked to early childhood trauma. In contrast to Miller's (1996) ideas, the environment is emphasized in trauma-induced shame-proneness (Gilbert, in Gilbert & Andrews, 1998). Shame is an integral aspect of socialization, but when it results from physical, sexual, and emotional abuse of children, it can produce long-lived symptoms (p. 27-28). Donald Dutton (1998) has also linked early shaming and abuse to high levels of adult anger and violence. Childhood trauma is linked to many forms of adult psychopathology (in Gilbert & Andrews, 1998) and antisocial behavior (cited in Dutton, 1998).

But as Gilbert (1998) points out, trauma is relative to one's perception (p. 40). There is extreme trauma such as sexual abuse, and there is trauma of less magnitude, which to the outside world may not seem traumatic at all. When thinking about the category of trauma, Gilbert states that it is best to think of it in relation to different categories as well as at different levels of intensity. What is traumatic for a child may seem minor for an adult. Indeed our own adult reaction can be one of disavowal about the seriousness of the impact on us. However, both adults and children handle serious trauma in a variety of ways. One commonly written about is dissociation, which essentially means to split off or separate from (Lewis, 1992). Dissociation is a generic term. It can mean the splitting of personalities (Multiple Personality Disorder), and it can be used to describe the substitution of one emotion for another (Lewis, 1992). Moreover, it can also imply the expression of one, or no emotion, then a person is feeling a different emotion (In Saarni & Harris, 1989).

There is little doubt, based on the findings of Dutton (1998) and others, that some of the participants in the high anger group will have experienced some degree of interpersonal trauma during childhood. It is also possible that all participants in this group will have experienced childhood trauma, and one of the aims of the present study is, where ethically possible, to explore the nature of these experiences, and how they impacted on the participant both as a child and as an adult.

Some questions that will guide the present research are: is there a particular group of experiences that are considered traumatic and that predispose a person to ongoing shame vulnerability? It is possible that some participants may have experienced many different forms of trauma, but because of desensitization, they eventually ceased seeing them as traumatic. The thought here is of harsh physical punishment. Does the effect of it decrease over time, and is it the fact that it is administered over time that is associated with shame? These questions will be explored during the analysis of data.

Shame is considered a self-regarding emotion by many theorists. A brief outline of how the self is conceptualized in the literature will follow.

The Self

Knowledge about the self is central to human existence. Who am I? What am I? How am I? These are all questions, which we think about constantly, whether consciously or

unconsciously (Lewis, 1992). 'People not only attend to and process information about themselves, but they also act on the basis of the resulting (cognitive) representations about themselves' (Oosterwegel & Oppenheimer, 1993, p. xii). When theories about the self began to emerge in the early part of the twentieth century, the self was characterized broadly as dynamic, multidimensional system, which had at its core 'a dialectic between the person and his [sic] environment' (p. xii), with different emphasis being given to either social (parenting, society, culture) or individual (cognitive, affective, maturational) forces. For example, Mead saw the self as a 'social construct' that is produced through the 'appropriation' of 'the attitudes of others in the social environment towards oneself' (p. xii).

These early views reflect a contemporary view of self-development, wherein the 'self-system develops in reciprocal interaction between the child and the social environment (p. 163). This view is similar to Baldwin (1879/1973, cited in Oosterwegel, & Oppenheimer, 1993), who said both agents are active in the process of constructing self-knowledge. Children require examples of standards of behavior from the environment, yet these examples are mediated by innate capabilities such as personality, and prior learning (p. 13). In other words, the same event will be 'perceived and processed' by different children, thus giving rise to individual differences in behavior.

The contemporary view (e.g., Oosterwegel & Oppenheimer, 1993) of self-concept is very much that of a 'dynamic and multidimensional system'. For example we not only know ourselves on a number of levels, but the content of each category of knowing changes with each developmental stage. Take for example the idea of the idealized self and the actual self. Studies have shown that, in young children (6 years old), these selves are close together, yet the child can differentiate between them. As the child gets older, the distance between them increases (p. 164). Also of interest is that by age 9, children are clearly able to distinguish between their own actual self-concept and the actual self-concept that others hold of them. These differences are mediated by closeness of the relationship to parents, in that the closer the relationship, the less the discrepancy.

Within the literature on the self, one of the predominant notions is that individuals strive to lessen the gap between actual self and ideal self (Morrison, 1987, in Miller, 1996). Ideal self becomes a standard against which we measure our actual selves. It is this

discrepancy between ideal and actual self that Nathanson (1992) and others see as the generator for pride and shame. In simple terms, closeness of the two selves is associated with positive affect, and distance is associated with negative affect. For Nathanson, the self is arranged along an axis of pride and shame, and it is shame and shame-related emotion that is generated when the two selves are perceived as being too distant from each other.

The model of self referred to above gives equal weight to social agents as influencing self-concept. Therefore it is not only our own perception of the discrepancy between the selves which is important, but also the perceptions of others, especially parents. What is important to note here is that because the self-system is considered dynamic and multidimensional, outcomes like self-esteem and other kinds of self-knowledge are expected to be dynamic as well. For example, self-esteem is likely to fluctuate within an individual over time and place. A multidimensional and dynamic view may be contrasted with a view of the self-system as an essentially static entity wherein the concept of the self over time seems to unfold in a predictable manner. By focusing on discrete elements of the self-system system, there is a risk of ignoring the dynamic interplay between these elements and the elements of different systems (e.g., affect). There is the sense within the shame literature that emphasis is given to the latter view. That is, both shame and self are construed as static systems, interacting with each other, and that is why we can say that shame results from injury to the self.

If however, a view were taken of the self as a dynamic system, then one would assume that shame is subject to the same dynamic influences. One could then describe shame as a dynamic system that has an emotional aspect to it, rather than an affect or an emotion. This is a reasonable way to think about shame if one wants to move away from a conception of it as purely an emotional state (e.g., Tangney *et al.*, in Gilbert, & Andrews, 1998 p. 3-31) and account for its ubiquity in life.

If one accepts or even entertains the notion of shame as a dynamic system, then logically the relationship between shame and anger must also be dynamic. Within the literature, there appears to be two possibilities in defining the relationship between shame and anger. Either shame causes anger, or anger leads to shame. How then does this explain enduring anger? Can we say that the anger that these individuals experience is generated by shame, and that their shame is generated by anger? This idea of circular causality is

what H. B. Lewis (1973, in Lewis, M. 1992) calls a 'feeling trap'. In order for this notion to explain chronic anger, one would have to posit the enduring experience of shame. In relation to this, we can ask, do high-anger men feel chronically ashamed of themselves? In this context, participants will be asked to explore the ways in which they see themselves now and at different times of their lives.

Anger

Anger is generally seen as a primary negative emotion, which has the evolutionary function of energizing the organism for defense (Izard, in Strongman, 1996). In the course of evolutionary development, in which humans became more complex both socially and psychologically, anger (and all other emotion) developed in relation to a diversity of functions. However, at the most basic level, it is seen as a reaction to threat, and is coupled with the action tendency to 'fight', (Lazarus, 1991) defend, and generally mobilize energy toward goal directed activity (Izard, 1991). In this context anger is said to be adaptive, and as such, may be associated with existential development in terms of assertion, self-empowerment, boundary definition (Paivio, 1999), and proximity issues (Bowlby, 1973).

Anger is perhaps best recognized as being associated with frustration (Berkowitz, 1993). In his frustration-aggression hypothesis, Berkowitz proposes that anger is a natural response to frustration of any kind, which also includes having ones goal thwarted. In Berkowitz's theory, anger has as part of its behavioral tendency, the urge to aggress. In this context, anger is triggered by 'aversive' stimuli, which covers a wide range of possibilities, including other emotions. In a reformulation of his hypothesis, Berkowitz (1993) proposes, "negative affect, in general, fosters feelings of anger and the instigation to aggress" (cited in Tangney *et al.*, 1996, p. 798).

Within 'experiential psychology' (see Paivio, 1999), anger can be seen as either a primary, secondary, or instrumental emotion, depending on the context in which it is experienced (p. 312). As a primary emotion, anger is triggered by threat, and it prepares the organism to act in a protective manner. As a secondary emotion, anger is seen to result from an emotional or cognitive process. That is, anger occurs as the result of a causal chain of events, which may involve thinking negatively about someone, or as the result of experiencing shame or fear. Whereas anger as a primary emotion occurs in direct response

to threat, the experience of secondary anger may be devoid of threat. In this context anger is seen as maladaptive, and is generally associated with negative consequences for the individual experiencing it and those around them, although this is not necessarily always the case.

As an instrumental emotion, anger is seen as being used for a purpose, often for accruing a benefit to the individual who is angry. In this sense, anger is seen in the service of meeting the needs of the instigator, and may not necessarily be seen as a reaction to threat. According to Paivio (1999), instrumental anger is the type of anger most likely to be dealt with in psychotherapy, because, although the instigator may be quite unconscious of it, it is associated with the control of others, through intimidation and the use of force.

Moreover, authors such as Lazarus (1991) and Averill (1982) view anger in terms of defense of the self. Anger is a normal reaction to slight, rebuff, and general attacks against one's sense of self. At least this is how it is seen within the interpersonal domain. In this context, anger is a reaction to a shame-related experience, or a potentially shame-eliciting situation. Indeed this is the dynamic that is at the core of H. Lewis's shame-rage spiral (1971, in Lewis, M. 1992). Within this conception of anger, we react with anger as a response to being shamed, which in turn causes shame and anger in the other person, thus setting up a cycle that will endure until it is broken.

Theoretical Perspectives on Shame-Anger

There are a variety of perspectives, which speak directly about the relationship between shame and anger. Cognitive-affective theory (Lewis, 1992), and Affect theory (Nathanson, 1992) will be outlined, as well as theories deriving from self-psychology and psychoanalysis (Kohut, in Miller, 1996).

Cognitive-Affective Theory

Michael Lewis (1992) sees shame as arising from an attribution process. Shame is an extreme and painful emotion, and according to Lewis, it is because of this that anger may be used as a substitute for it. Generally he sees shame as arising from attributions about the role of the self in relation to failure vis-à-vis standards, rules and goals. Shame is an attack on the self-system, and repeated shaming or chronic shame are linked by Lewis and others to the 'disintegration of the self-system' (p. 144). Part of his theorizing concerns the different socialization patterns for emotion and its expression for males and females. Lewis proposes that we have choices about how to deal with shame, and that these choices are based on differential socialization of emotions and their respective expression among males and females.

Women are more likely according to Lewis to display depressive symptomology in relation to chronic shame, because they are socialized to suppress or inhibit the expression of anger and aggression (see also Magai, Distal, & Liker, 1995). On the other hand, anger and aggression are socially approved of and implicitly condoned within male socialization practices (p. 144-145). Because of this socialization bias, females will tend to 'use' more internally oriented shame substitutions such as depression, and males will tend towards more outward directed substitutions such as anger and aggression. Women are particularly likely to feel shame in relation to interpersonal conflicts and abuse, because intimate interaction has a different meaning for women than it does for men. That is, it is more important for them (p. 144). They will also tend to attribute blame for intimate conflict and abuse to themselves, an idea that is supported by many studies. Thus they are likely to feel shame. Men are more likely to externalize blame, and therefore less likely to hold themselves responsible for abuse and conflict.

In Lewis's theory, anger is seen as a substitute for shame, that is preferred by males because is seen as acceptable within male culture. Both Nathanson (1992) and Lewis (1992) point to the glorification of the angry, wronged man, in movies and literature, as examples of the cultural attitudes towards injustice. Conversely, there is no glory or redemption for those who accept their pathetic weakness (except maybe in comedy).

Much of Michael Lewis's (1992) theorizing about shame-anger, is based on ideas developed by the psychoanalytic researcher Helen Lewis (in Lewis, M, 1992). Lewis (1971) postulated 2 levels of shame — acknowledged and unacknowledged shame. Acknowledged shame is analogous to consciously felt shame. Unacknowledged shame is divided onto 2 levels: overt or undifferentiated shame, where the person has a shame reaction but can't identify it, and bypassed shame. The former is identified by Lewis (1971) through certain contextual markers, one of which involves the use of shame-related adjectives such as, incompetent, awkward, foolish, inadequate, etc. (Lewis, 1971 in Scheff, 1997). Lewis (1971) sees these terms as 'disguising the shame experience' (p. 86).

H. B. Lewis was able to identify these terms as shame related because they occurred in conjunction with 2 other specific events: (1) the patients perceived the self as negatively evaluated either by self or other(s), and (2) change in the patients manner, such as speech disruption, lowered or averted gaze, blushing and drop in loudness of speech, sometimes to the point of inaudibility (p. 86).

These behaviors are seen as clues to unacknowledged shame, and, because they are overtly identifiable, are able to be observed as 'time sequences', which form the basis of causal explanations of shame and anger (Scheff, 1997). For example, Susan Retzinger (cited in Scheff, 1997), used these 'contextual clues' to study shame-anger interactions, and the results of her work show that angry conflicts between intimate partners, were immediately preceded by these markers of shame. The inference is that shame was experienced prior to anger. These findings are valid only if one accepts that the 'cues' are in fact markers of shame. They may in fact be part of the anger experience, and as such unrelated to shame. In contrast to Retzinger's approach, which is dealing with specific instances of anger, the current study is interested in shame-anger over long periods of time, that is, as an enduring pattern.

The focus will now return to Lewis's (1992) cognitive-affective approach to shame-anger. The question is asked, if shame is so painful, how could the person experiencing it, shut it out, as it were? Lewis (1992, p. 122) posits an attention hypothesis, wherein the individual simply attends to something else, thereby removing 'objective awareness' of the shame experience. That is, while the *feeling* of shame may be felt, 'it is not chosen as a

focus' (p. 123). The mind makes a switch, very rapidly, to another mode. In repression, the mind says 'it is not there', and by not attending, the mind is saying 'go away'.

The other level referred to by Lewis is bypassed shame, where the person has a shame reaction, which is not, however, felt as shame. Here, the same perception of negative evaluation occurs, but the markers, instead of having a diminishing quality, seem to increase, for example, speech has a faster more repetitive quality that Lewis calls obsessive. In bypassed shame the individual appears to be 'avoiding the pain of shame before it is actually experienced' (p. 87). This idea forms the basis of Michael Lewis's idea that anger is a substitute for shame. However, Gilbert points out that if the idea of unacknowledged shame is accepted, then, as opposed to Lewis's 'anger as substitution hypothesis', anger may be seen as a 'conditioned response' to shame (in Gilbert & Andrews, 1998). Therefore a shame-eliciting event will instead instantly evoke anger. In this context, as with bypassed shame, the owner of the shame is not aware of the shame. As far as can be ascertained, there is no research or theorizing in this area.

The idea that a person can be experiencing shame, which is at the same time beyond their conscious awareness is intriguing, and presents several interesting possibilities. Gilbert (1998, p. 21) asks the question, can shame occur in the absence of negative evaluation of the self? In other words, is a person who has transgressed an important moral/social rule, actually experiencing shame, while not being conscious of it? Or is it that shame is not experienced in these circumstances, in spite of the knowledge that *it ought to be*. This area will be explored within the present study, by asking what is it about certain situations that provoke participant's anger. Is there a shame element, and are they aware of it at the time of becoming angry?

Self-Psychology Theory

Heinz Kohut (1972, in Ornstein, 1999, p. 283-293) talks about anger as reactive (secondary), and coined the term 'narcissistic rage', to describe a 'broad range of angry reactions deriving from injury to self-esteem (p. 283), and/or a vulnerable self (p. 284). By vulnerable self, Kohut is talking about a 'fragmented' self, which has its origins in the parental, caregiving relationship of infancy. Kohut refers to two hypothesized aspects of

the emerging self, which can be disrupted in infancy. The first is self-esteem, its development being disrupted by lack of parental mirroring (validation, attunement, acknowledgment, approval) (p. 285). The second has to do with the ideal self, which because of the lack of empathic attunement in infancy, develops into a concept completely out of proportion to the infants actual 'devalued' and fragmented self.

The infant develops exaggerated defenses in relation to an injured self. Part of this defense strategy involves a re-casting of the self, as all-powerful, grand, and exceedingly self-important (Miller, 1996). This is the basis of 'narcissistic disorders'. Essentially, the narcissistic person is one whose self is a manifestation of the reaction against unmet key attachment needs. One of the results of the above process is that the individual never develops the ability to self-sooth, or to regulate affect. Narcissistic individuals have unrealistically high standards and expectations which they may or may not impose on themselves, but which they certainly impose on those around them. Disappointment in relation to these standards is inevitable, and it gives rise to a sense of shame, to which the individual may react with rage.

Important within this conception, is the idea that anger can occur at any intensity, and in any situation, and at any age. For Kohut, whether the anger is rage or mild annoyance, it is as a sub-conscious reaction to injury to the self (p. 285). As the individual develops, the very patterns inherent within the narcissistic grouping prevents self-awareness of the problem, and of course the solution. As the narcissistically disordered individual encounters social life on an increasingly complex level (as they develop), so the complexity and intensity of their behavior increases. This is especially marked within intimate relationships, wherein unrealistic demands will likely lead to irresolvable conflict and possibly more destructive ways of coping (Miller, 1996).

H. B Lewis (1983c, in Gilbert & Andrews, 1998, p. 6) used the term 'humiliated fury' to describe protest anger 'related to the breaking of a bond' Lewis's work is based on Bowlby (1973), who proposed that the origin of anger arousal takes place between the mother and infant. In this context, the infant cries to attract the parent to her. If the mother is unresponsive, the baby increases the intensity of her cry. As long as the parent does not react, the infant becomes more and more angry, until it is finally in a rage. Anger may be seen in this context as energizing the infant so that its call can be heard at a distance.

Lewis postulated that humiliation was part of the infant's experience, because the caregiver had violated an inbuilt expectancy held by the infant that the mother would respond to its call. The problem with this approach, according to Gilbert (1998), is that it is impossible to ascertain whether the baby is actually feeling humiliated, and that the anger being expressed is not frustration. However, for an adult it may be easier to posit humiliation as a possible cause of anger, especially if the definition of humiliation used involves being made a fool of, either by oneself or others. But again we come back to definitional issues. Many researchers see shame and humiliation as separate emotions, with different elicitors, and reactions (in Miller, W. 1993), but as already mentioned, the definition of shame used in the present study incorporates humiliation as a variant form.

Nathanson and Affect Theory

Nathanson (1992), views shame from an Affect Theory perspective, which is a comprehensive theory that attempts to link a multitude of perspectives (biological, behavioral, social learning, developmental, self-ego theories) to explain shame (and all other emotions). Nathanson's ideas have been used in a very broad way to guide the theoretical orientation of the present study, and so some of the core ideas of affect theory will also be laid out in the following.

Affect is the 'purely biological portion of emotion. When an affect has been triggered, it means that a 'definable stimulus has activated a mechanism which releases a known pattern of biological events' (p. 49). Each affect has its own genetically written pattern, which activates sites around the body in a way that is specific only to that affect. These patterns are known as 'scripts'. When we experience shame affect for example, the muscles around the neck and shoulders loose 'tonus' causing the head to hang, and the shoulders to slump. Our thinking becomes confused, and we are unable to keep eye contact with those around us. This is all part of a script, over which we have little or no control.

Affect is not emotion. Affect is the biological essence of emotion. In Nathanson's formulation, as infants we experience affect when the affect is triggered. We become

familiar with the affect as well as what triggered it. Clusters of similar affective experiences are stored as groupings or 'bundles' in memory. For an emotion to occur, we need a stimulus, which triggers the affect, which in turn triggers a scanning of related memories. In Nathanson's (1992) theory, it is the combination of affective 'script', plus previous experience, plus current trigger, which cause emotion (p. 377). Concerning shame, intense emotion is caused in part by the intensity of previous shame experiences.

An adult, who was severely shamed as a child, will have powerful memories of this experience. According to Nathanson (1992), these memories also contain the reaction, or more precisely, the typical reaction of the individual to the affect. How one reacts to an affect becomes part of a library of scripts. Different reactions to shame, for example, will be stored as different shame scripts. As scripts relating to joy are concerned with the maximizing of joy, shame scripts are concerned with the reduction of shame. As we grow, and experience shame in a variety of situations, we form scripts which not only seek to reduce shame, but which must also take into account the safety of the organism. With children, attachment concerns and physical vulnerability are paramount, and so the scripts of childhood accommodate these needs. Scripts may also differ in that they are associated with other emotions besides shame. Nathanson stresses that co-assemblies of emotions, such as shame-fear-despair or shame-anger-contempt, are likely to characterize different scripts, which are predominantly used at different stages of development. Shame-fear-despair, are more likely to be found co-assembled in childhood and so are more likely to help shape childhood scripts.

Nathanson theorizes that there are four general categories for coping with shame, and all have the goal of shame reduction and modulation. These different methods represent four directions that behavior typically takes, making up what he calls the 'Compass of Shame'. At one pole there are scripts of withdrawal, at another, scripts of attack self. The other poles represent scripts of avoidance and *attack other*.

Withdrawal can be physical and/or psychological. One can disappear from social life both inside and outside the family by 'keeping a low profile, or 'laying low'. Or, one can withdraw into oneself, which likely entails being unavailable, distant, and withdrawn to those around them, in spite of being physically present. It is the posture of aloneness and self-protection against further shame. In this context nothing can be done to alter the

source of shame, and it is something that simply has to be lived with. Withdrawal is associated with depression (p. 370)

Attack self-scripts involve ‘functioning on a level of reduced self-esteem’ in order to ‘guarantee affiliation’ with a more powerful other. These are the scripts of deference, conformity, and masochism according to Nathanson (1992), wherein one accepts a lower and possibly humiliating position in order to maintain interpersonal connection.

Avoidance scripts cover a wide range of behaviors usually with the goal of convincing others, and ourselves that we are worthy. This may involve alcohol and drug use in an effort to forget or ignore and drown out negative feelings about the self. It also could be the fitness fanatic or body-builder, who are trying to create an image of themselves based on strength and beauty to offset a sense of low self-worth. It could also simply be denial or disavowal of some deeply felt negativity about the self, in which case an individual may refuse to accept or to perceive negative information about the self. *Avoidance* may also involve extremes of work or sports in an effort to redefine the self and blend into a system that values excellence. In this context, competition and comparison, are expressions of an *avoidance script*. Not surprisingly this pole of the compass of shame is associated with narcissism. Nathanson (1992) also suggests that it could involve aligning oneself with people or groups who are associated with pride. This is what is known as ‘borrowed pride (p. 351).

Attack other scripts involve the reducing of another’s self-esteem in order to make oneself feel better. This can take many forms including physical degradation of another (bullying, intimidation, violence etc), verbal and emotional abuse of another (sarcasm, putting-down, cynicism, etc.). According to Nathanson, this script is associated with anger, externalization of blame, and having power over others (p. 370). It is the script of sadism.

Is anger tied to shame via a particular script, or is it part of all, or some scripts? Tangney *et al.*, (1996) suggests that anger is also associated with a brooding, seething form of anger, which people find ‘difficult to express (p. 798). Therefore the possibility that anger will be associated with withdrawal and avoidance scripts, albeit as a more hidden component than of the attack other script, will be explored in the present study. More generally, the boundaries of Nathanson’s categories will also be explored, both across time, and in relation to specific stages of development.

Aims Of the Study

This study will explore both the structure and content of the relationship between shame and anger. The study of shame-anger is a relatively unexplored area, and as can be seen by the review just undertaken, there are many contentious issues therein that require research. Many questions have been posed within this review, and they will not be replicated here. Broadly put, the aim of this study is to try and map conceptual domains, and the relationships and linkages between them. These domains will be derived from the context of everyday experience. It is expected that there will be diversity of experiences, but that there will be patterns and themes, which they hold in common. It is not the intention to reduce these patterns down to an axiom, but rather, to identify what they are and where they might be found. In order to do this, emphasis must be placed on context, and meaning associated with such contexts.

It is expected that contexts change, both within shorter time frames, and over longer developmental periods. It is assumed that participants are able to recount and differentiate between different contexts, and that within certain contexts, they will be aware of significant emotion themes and what gave rise to them. This study will attempt to tap this knowledge, and to reconstruct it within an analytical framework, designed to explore the themes therein. The depth to which the analysis can go is determined by several limiting factors, of which available time is the most salient. As Scheff (1997), points out, volumes can be written about one case, but the choice made in this study is to write with brevity on multiple cases. Therefore compromise is necessary. In trying to arrive at informative conclusions, both the integrity of participants, and an appreciation of their knowledge, counterbalance the thrust of theoretical knowledge. What is aimed for is to maintain the integrity of both.

Ethical Considerations

The University of Canterbury Ethics Committee approved the present study, but sought and received assurance from the author that participants would be directed to an

appropriate counsellor/psychotherapist should they become adversely affected by the content of the interview. In no case was this necessary. All participants, prior to data collection signed a consent form, and were given an information sheet outlining their right to withdraw from the study and guarantee of anonymity.

Design

The present study is characterized as qualitative multi-case case study in design (Willig, 2001). As such, it seeks to compare themes and patterns, which are associated with the object of study, found within one group (study group), with those of another group (control group). The object of study is the relationship between shame and anger. It is exploratory in nature, but as well it seeks to test an existing theory. The approach is broad and eclectic (see Flick, 1998; Taylor & Bogden, 1998; McCracken, 1988; and others).

Willig (2001), points out that the research design should be chosen ‘in the light of the research question’ (p. 76). The research question for the present study is: does having a chronic sense of shame about oneself predispose one to chronic anger, and conversely, does chronic anger predispose one to feel shame? Theory tells us that shame is a significant part of the picture, and that it is hidden well below the surface - all we see is anger. Therefore, an understanding of shame will require both a sensitive and a deeply penetrating instrument. That is, to see what is hidden requires that the researcher understands the individual as they understand themselves, and in order to do this, a high level of empathy is required.

Method Section

Pilot Study

Prior to writing the research proposal, the researcher conducted a small (N= 4) pilot study in which participants were given a semi-structured interview, asking about their experiences of shame and anger. The intention of the study was, a) to see if interviews were likely to yield relevant information from the proposed sample of high anger individuals, b) to verify the researcher's effectiveness at interviewing, c) to orient the researcher towards areas of participant experience that were likely to yield relevant information and, d) to assist in the development of an interview schedule.

Through this process an idea was gained of the depth and detail which participants '*might*' be willing to go to, when talking about shame/anger in the context of their personal lives. It was learned from this early study that the sharing of shame related information was extremely difficult for participants, and that it required a high level of trust and safety on the part of the interviewee. But when these conditions were met, participants were encouragingly willing to explore deeply personal experiences with the interviewer.

Participants

The study seeks to compare two groups. After consulting the relevant literature (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998) it was decided to limit the number of participants to between 5 and 10 individuals per group. This number is based on time and resource constraints, as well as on the notion that in such studies, the fewer participants, the more the opportunity for in-depth exploration (p. 93). Selection of participants is guided by the theoretical sampling technique proposed by Glaser and Strauss (1967, in Taylor & Bogdan 1998, p. 93). This approach emphasizes that it is not the number of cases that is important, rather it

is 'the potential of each case to aid the researcher in developing theoretical insights into the area' being studied. Subjects were recruited using the *snowballing* technique, wherein acquaintances and contacts (hence forth known as informants) were approached, told of the study, and asked if they knew of individuals who fitted the criteria.

Criteria for the study group were that the individual had completed an *anger management* course or something similar, and that they were known by the informant to be suitably angry men, and of course willing to participate in the research. Such broad criteria set the net wide with the intention of drawing samples from those who represented different perspectives on the same theme (as per theoretical sampling) (p. 93).

Informants were asked to contact potential participants and seek initial consent. Because there were no demographic criteria for selection, it was decided best, for matters of group compatibility, to recruit and collect data from the study group first, after which time the control group was selected so as to match as closely as possible demographic qualities of the study group.

Recruitment proved extremely difficult, mainly because of the nature of the material to be talked about. Ultimately 7 study-group and 8 control group participants were recruited with a mean age of 39, and 42 years old respectively. Both groups consisted of males from various backgrounds, the majority with a working class background, the minority from middle-class backgrounds. Due to time constraints, data from only 6 control group interviews were included in the analysis.

Having expressed interest through the informant, potential participants were then contacted by telephone, at which time the aims and procedure of interviews were relayed, and questions were answered. It is noted that some potential participants agreed outright to do the interview, while others were highly skeptical, and required a great deal of reassurance and time to make up their minds. Finding participants and organizing and carrying out interviews was an arduous process, and the period from initial planning and contact, to the completion of interviews took between 5 and 6 months.

Materials and Procedure

Participants were given a semi-structured, in-depth rapport interview (Massarik, in Hayes, 1997 p. 115), of between 1.5 and 2 hours in duration. The rapport interview took the form of a conversation, which, through interviewer guidance, covered material relevant to the subject of investigation (p. 103). Interviews were conducted in participants homes in order to reduce a sense of intimidation, which a more formal environment is likely to have engendered (Flick 1998). An audio tape recorder was used to record interviews.

McCracken (1988) was particularly useful in thinking about how to approach the interview, both in preparation and execution. He proposes a '4 step method of enquiry', some of which will be outlined briefly here. Although his is largely a sociological approach, the suggestions he makes proved useful for the present study.

The first step emphasizes the importance of the literature review as a source of orientation and expectations, which can be both met or proven wrong (p. 31). That is, from a sound theoretical base one can recognize and follow up on ideas that are counter to expectations. Therefore a literature review was carried out that far exceeded that cited in the literature review section of this report.

The second step (called 'Review of Cultural Categories'), involves one's own experiences of that which is being studied. Within this process, the interviewer explores his/her own experience of the relevant phenomena, trying to discover relationships and categories not found in the literature, looking at configurations and connections as a means of orienting oneself as to which questions are useful. Such exploration also helps to familiarize oneself with one's own assumptions, so as to be able keep them at a 'distance' during the interview process.

The third step is to formulate the questionnaire (in this case the interview schedule) and then do the interview. McCracken (1988) suggests that the interviews begin with general biographical questions (also known as 'grand-tour' questions, by Spradley, 1979, in McCracken 1988, p. 35), followed by general 'question areas', within which essential areas of research interests are explored. He suggests many ways to guide and keep the

interview going including various methods of 'prompting' and 'playing dumb'. The fourth step involves data analysis, and will not be referred to here.

The 'question areas' were set up within the simplest format possible. Shame was one area, and anger was another. The researcher was interested in these emotions not as discrete emotions existing at one point in time, but as experiences that went through a process of formation developing over time. To this end, it was thought that historical-biographical data would follow the natural development of emotions over time. The categories of childhood, adolescence, and adulthood, were seen as general areas of enquiry, and they formed the conceptual framework of the interviews. However, the researcher had no pre-conceived ideas about the age boundaries of these categories, or whether certain periods within them would be more significant than others. From these broad categories, subcategories of time could be explored so as to ensure continuity of data. For example the participant was questioned about early, middle and late adolescence, which produced a dynamic picture of their emotional development during this stage. Flexibility would be required by the interviewer as to the chronological order in which interviewees related their life experience.

Once participants were oriented to a particular stage, for example, childhood, they were asked about anger and shame in that context. This generally led to narratives about family, relationships to individual members, feelings about themselves, and a host of other relevant areas. If a participant's statement sounded interesting, it was followed up. Through this method the researcher gained an appreciation of the connectedness of internal states to external situations. Without having to worry about adherence to the interview schedule, full attention could be given to the creative process at hand - to the unfolding narrative.

The emphasis of the interview was on the participants' emotional experience of the period in question, and how that gave rise to certain thoughts and behavior, as well as the emotional consequences of that behavior. As mentioned, the focus was on the dynamic nature of these levels of interaction. It was assumed by the researcher that these linkages would not be conscious to participants, that is, they would not be aware of either how shame and anger interacted, or how emotions interacted with behavior and vice-versa. So

an indirect approach was used, wherein behavior and environmental factors were talked about in relation to shame and anger.

The relevant literature was also consulted regarding styles of questioning. Questions were asked in a non-directive way so as not to put pressure on respondents to answer in a way that might compromise the validity of data (Brenner, 1985). The interviewer endeavored to establish a non-obtrusive stance (Taylor & Bogden, 1998), and above all remained non-judgmental at all times during the interview (Rogers, in Kirschenbaum & Henderson, 1987).

As can be seen above, much work and planning went into interview preparation. However as recommended by Taylor & Bogden (1998), an open mind was kept as to the structure and format of the interview. It was decided before interviewing began, to transcribe the first interview, and scrutinize it as to whether the style of questioning and content of questions brought forth the relevant data, and whether they were complete enough to be used for analysis. This reflexivity proved to be extremely effective for improving the collection of data, and was maintained throughout the interviewing process. It also allowed for gaps in the data to be identified and revisited through a 'short' follow-up interview', either in person or, if this was not possible, by phone. It also proved necessary to monitor the quality of tape recordings, as one complete interview was found to be of such poor quality, the whole interview had to be repeated. In another case, large segments were inaudible, and a short follow-on interview was necessary.

Transcription

The researcher carried out transcription of interviews. Due to the unavailability of a suitable transcription machine, the same portable tape recorder that was used to record the interviews was used. As per the recommendation of Taylor & Bogden (1998), along with the researcher's supervisor, interviews were transcribed verbatim. Using guidelines set out by Bruce (1992, cited in Flick, 1998, p. 175), a suitable system of transcription was developed by the researcher, which incorporated the criteria that the text be easy to read, convey literally what was being said, that it be easy to write, and easy to search. Certain

conventions from Drew (1995, in Flick, 1998, p. 175) were also used. For example pause lengths were marked using seconds within brackets (e.g. (3) = 3 second pause).

Also, as recommended by Flick (1998), ideas and clarifications garnered both from field notes and the text itself were included in brackets within the text. These notes amount to the researcher's interpretation of either what was said, or are based on contextual clues given by the participant. In this sense, they are clues as to the meaning of what the participant was thought to be communicating. Transcribed copies were stored on the hard drive of the researcher's computer, and were backed up using floppy disk.

Analysis

In the very broadest terms, data were treated using thematic analysis (Flick 1998). In short, individual texts were summarized and written up as cases. It was decided to name individual participants in such a way that they were easily identifiable as members of either group. The high-anger group was given names beginning with A (for Anger), and non-angry participants were given names beginning with N (for Non-angry). This was done to avoid unwieldy, formal references to participants within the analysis. Participants can simply be talked about in terms such as 'when we compare Anthony and Neil on this level etc....' This approach also personalizes the cases, and ensures that they remain so throughout the analytical process.

Cases were scanned for themes and patterns, which were then coded. These were then aggregated for the two groups, and compared. Concurrently, an analysis specific to Nathanson's (1992) theoretical ideas was carried out, and findings from this process were over-laid onto the thematic data to form a composite picture. The stages of analysis just outlined will be elaborated next, beginning with coding procedures.

Cases and Coding

There is a lot of debate and divergent points of view in the qualitative analysis literature as to whether coding is part of the analysis or preempts and is separate from it

(see Coffee & Atkinson, 1996, chap. 2, for a review of issues). Essentially, researchers differ in the degree to which they include analysis within the coding process. By itself, coding is analogous to tagging categories relevant to the object of study, and reducing information to an analyzable format, for example, from broad categories to sub-categories, down to units such as a word or phrase, which supposedly captures the essence of the original data (p. 31).

On the other hand, many authors see coding as an integral part of analysis, and that analysis begins when coding begins (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996, p. 30-41). In short, categories can be imposed onto the text or they can emerge from the text. In order to arrive at categories which emerge from the texts, a level of conceptual thought is necessary, and from this process, previously unthought of questions are asked and tentative linkages are made (p. 47).

The approach used in the present study was based broadly on this idea. Categories were arrived at theoretically as well as from the texts. As mentioned in the methods section, interviews were examined for conceptual categories and their inter-relationships, as they were being collected. It could be said then that coding and analysis began at this stage, and what is written in the analysis section proper is a continuation of this early work. This point notwithstanding, coding and analysis are seen to have begun at the case write-up stage and it is this stage we will proceed from. For the sake of exposition, coding and analysis will be treated as separately in the following.

Coding was carried out using techniques suggested by Coffey & Atkinson (1996). In order to arrive at categories for the case study, each transcript was divided into its aggregate parts. This was done using a simple read – identify – and retrieve method (p. 29). Reading (identifying) was done both with categories in mind (shame and anger) and with a view to identifying new categories which seemed significant for the participant. Categories arrived at were, memories of father, memories of mother, talk about siblings, talk about self, talk about anger, talk about shame, memories of self, attributions (general). Sections of relevant text were identified, and cut and pasted into separate files. Each file formed a category. There they were arranged in roughly chronological order, and marked with the line number at which they started in the transcribed text. This made referencing and checking for contextual information easy and fast.

When considering writing up the cases, one of the principal objectives was that the case narrative be as close to the original text as possible (Tesch, 1990, cited in Coffey & Atkinson, 1996, p. 30). Therefore, in an effort to fully understand what was being said, and what was meant by participants, further coding of subcategories took place prior to writing up the cases. The shame and anger categories were broken down using a color-coding technique (p. 29). Shame was divided into shame from own actions, shame from others actions, shame through shaming. Anger sub-categories were, anger from injustice, anger as trait, anger at self, anger at others. So the file named 'shame' was separated into temporal categories of development, and different qualities of shame experience were identified at different stages of life.

It was already decided that the structure of the cases would follow the developmental trail suggested within the interviews. That is, case narratives would begin in childhood, and progress through time until the present, thus taking in the broad categories of childhood, adolescence, and adulthood. Therefore the cases took the form of a retrospective narrative, which identifies and seeks to explain, using participant's own recollections, anger and shame across their life span.

Cases represent a two-fold aim in that they are a summary of the content of transcripts, as well as being a formative stage of analysis. For the sake of authenticity and maximum understanding of cases by the reader, quotes are used extensively throughout the cases.

Analysis of Cases

It was decided for the sake of continuity and clarity that analysis of individual narratives would be physically included as part of each case. Cases were divided into four sections. They are: case write-up (mentioned above), anger narrative, shame narrative, and anger/shame interaction narrative. After the case write-up was completed, it was scanned manually for both anger and shame narratives.

This stage represented the shedding of information in an attempt to reduce the amount of data, while at the same time, retain as much contextual information as possible. By separating anger and shame into different narratives, a clearer picture emerged as to the

nature of the individual's experience of that emotion at different stages of life. It also set the scene for the fourth section, which involved over-laying these two narratives, thus giving a clearer picture of shame-anger interaction, and the context from which it derived.

At this stage the researcher began to think about conceptual relationships between categories. For example, what does the participant theorize or remember of the transition from shame to anger as a child? Was there a point, event or period when they first became aware of anger? Were they angry before and not aware of it? These questions had been addressed in the interviews, and answers were provided. Participants have given a simple 'no' answer to this, yet scrutiny of the texts reveal that they had in fact been angry before the stated onset period. The writing of these sections represented a vital step regarding the validity of the information, and so a great deal of care was taken to balance what was actually said with other sometimes-conflicting contextual and verbal information from the text.

The fourth section of the case is titled 'Shame/Anger Interaction Themes'. It represents the *recontextualization* (Tesch, 1990, cited in Coffey & Atkinson, 1996, p. 30-31) of information whereby previously unconnected data are reassembled into a single narrative. Within this section, theoretical and conceptual linkages were made between participant accounts of shame and anger. Also ideas and questions, which had emerged from the previous two sections, were expanded upon and given voice during this section.

Within this section, Nathanson's (1992) strategies for shame reduction and modulation were examined. Inferences regarding his theoretical suppositions on shame related behavior were made with regards to participant's behavior. Where they were reported, participants' thoughts and feelings were incorporated in an attempt to clarify their behavior from their own point of view.

Within Group Analysis

The information processed so far has taken the form of four narratives for each individual. They are, case biography, anger narrative, shame narrative, and shame/anger interaction narrative. The next step in the analysis of data was to bring the narratives within

each group together in order to form a composite, or profile. This profile was made up of patterns (categories) and themes common to all participants within the group. The patterns were selected for their relevance to the object of study. As recommended by Coffey & Atkinson (1996, p. 46), attention was also paid to exceptional cases, or data that did not seem to fit the patterns.

The approach taken here is guided by Strauss's (1987, cited in Coffey & Atkinson, 1996 p. 49) idea that qualitative coding and analysis is not about the reduction and indexing of data, as much as it is about the generation of ideas and questions. In this context exceptional cases have a valid place within the analysis, because they raise key questions when viewed in relation to 'prototypical' cases. The object of the exercise then was not to reduce data to a set of abstract concepts, but rather to convey a dynamic picture, in which variation is as important as sameness in establishing patterns of characteristic behavior.

Having read and re-read the case studies, categories were selected with the view to retaining as much contextual information as possible. Childhood was obviously a rich source of understanding, because it could already be observed, at least in the study group, that this is where the relationship between shame and anger formed. It could also be observed that the most salient factors apropos the emergence of shame and anger were contained within family relationships. To explore these relationships further, the family category was broken down into sub-categories, which were further divided into study group, control group sub-categories, and written up as part of the analysis. Categories were, Mother, Father, Relationship Between Mother and Father (from participants perspective), Participants Relationship to Parents, Shame and the Family. Shaming Outside the Family was also presented as a separate category.

The next stage of the analysis involved an examination of the themes and patterns of anger for the two groups, which was followed by a drawing together of anger/shame interaction themes for each group. At this stage, information from immediately preceding categories, as well as individual case studies, was used to form a comprehensive picture of patterns and relationships between contexts and the affects being studied. Information was laid out in stages for both groups separately. This resulted in two narratives, one for each group.

The researcher was interested in Nathanson's (1992) compass of shame model, and its utility in explaining shame related behavior over time. So the next step was to aggregate relevant information from individual cases from each group, which had already carried out in the 'Shame/Anger Interaction Themes' section of individual cases. A simple grid was used, with individual participants down one axis, and the three stages (childhood, adolescence, and adulthood) across the top. Each case was reviewed and behavioral themes were identified for each person at each stage. The categories used were based on behaviors suggested by Nathanson's model.

CHAPTER TWO

Case Study #1: Anthony

Anthony is a 45-year-old general labourer, employed part time. He left school at 15 without formal qualification. He is married with 2 teenage daughters and is living in a stable family situation. He has a history of alcohol abuse and violence but does not seem to have been involved in criminality.

Anthony came across as a friendly and very calm person. During the pre-interview conversation he gave the impression of openness and curiosity about the subject matter of the interview. His conversation style was thoughtful and frank. He attempted to answer questions in a direct way, not straying at all from the subject under discussion. Therefore his answers were relatively short and unembellished as opposed to a monologue style encountered in other interviews. Anthony's general emotionality during the interview was stable and slightly sad or melancholic. For most of the time his eyes looked downwards, he was slumped forward and his voice was quiet. Pauses between words and phrases became noticeably longer when talking about painful memories including shaming situations. There was also a noticeable drop in volume and a tendency to mumble at these times.

In an effort to explore the linkages between shame and anger, the two will be treated separately in the following section. This will be followed by an interweaving of the two, which will incorporate the participant's own views.

Anger

Anthony was born in the early 1950's in Scotland and describes himself as working class. His parents separated when he was 4 and his father left. Anthony cites the reason for separation as his mother's very public affair with another man with whom she 'ran off' a short time later. Anthony was 4 years old at the time. He has 2 older brothers and all 3 children were fostered out to different relatives. The family and the immediate community condemned his mother's behavior. His earliest conscious memories of both shame and anger are associated with this event. Anthony's description of his mother gives a clue as to the state of his early family life particularly his mother's *modus operandi*. He describes her as being an 'alcoholic' at the time and as being 'totally out there'.

... she didn't know, she was a loose cannon so to speak, she didn't know how to deal with children or family life ... all she wanted to do was have a good time ... (L446)

The story of Anthony's mother's affair and of her leaving was public knowledge, and neighborhood children would tease him about it. His earliest recollection of anger and aggression that it occurred at around 4 or 5 years old and was set within the context of reacting to children who teased him about his mother. The basic message conveyed by the children was that his mother was a 'slut' and that she had abandoned her family.

...kids in ma school would tease me you know (2) your mother's a bloody a bloody slut...your mother ran away to London with another man...(2) and the kids just teasing me and it was really hurtful you know (L11)

Anthony and his brothers were put in a vulnerable position and from the outset defended their mother and family with violence.

... anybody sez anything I was into them ...that's where my first bout of violence came in when I was 4 or 5 (L351)

It was not stated whether anger or aggression was prevalent or even present within Anthony's family system before his parents split up. Nor is there any reference of violence in the family context. Where Anthony speaks of violence he is referring to himself and his two older brothers. What is obvious is that they had all learned to use violence from a very young age and that it was dominant among their range of problem solving skills. However aggression was only effective in the short term and the teasing escalated over time. Anthony's response was that he became increasingly angry and aggressive.

I learnt real quick that the way to stop them was to deal to them with violence, and it stopped it for a wee while ...(L355)

Anthony was obviously heavily influenced by his older brothers whom he looked to for guidance and support in dealing with the situation at hand. Their way of dealing with the situation was to develop ruthlessness in fighting which could be used to beat the enemy into silence. Anthony describes his use of violence as,

...protecting the family first ... I didn't give a shit about me, my first thought was to protect the family ...and I had 2 older brothers ...who were also good fighters so I'd go and tell them and we'd go and deal to these kids ...you've got to understand my family, the 3 brothers were all good fighters, and we put fear into people with our violence ...and we thought that was a way to get rid of things ...but it only alters it for a wee while ... (L359)

The above can be seen in the context of little or no caring adult support. The boys were effectively on their own. This is highlighted by Anthony's experience while living with his uncle and family from the age of 5 until 14. He describes the 9 years with his

uncle as 'the most horrible' time of his life. His uncle from the outset physically, emotionally and verbally abused him. There were constant and cruel putdowns. Much of the abuse was directly related to Anthony's mother's behavior ...

He put me down so so much ...he gave hidings all the time, I'd do some little thing wrong like put a cup on the arm of a chair ... I got a hiding for it ... and he'd say oh your mother's a bitch and a slut and, really hoe into me, so I kept that inside for years as well (L21)

The impact that his uncle had on him was profound. Despite some support from his grandmother and attempts to behave and stay out of trouble, Anthony grew into a very 'dysfunctional young man'. He describes himself from around 11 years old as

a horrible kid ...and I didn't care ...very violent, extremely violent...I mean I couldn't give a shit ...if I died it would have been alright by me you know (L405)

At 13 years old Anthony was in trouble with police and threatened with being put into a boys home. One example of his behavior at this time is that he beat a boy so badly he was hospitalized. He then went around and smashed all of the windows in the boy's mother's house.

I: What did the kid do who you beat up?

P: oh he teased me about my mumor my brother you know. I had a younger brother who had polio. He's got one short leg and one skinny leg ...they used to tease him and call him 'hoppy' (5) just things about the family [inaudible] ...and that would be it (L218)

But as Anthony grows up, feelings of anger towards his parents surfaces. He would blame them for 'any little thing that went wrong' - he blamed them for everything (L90). He could not understand why his parents 'couldn't make it' or why his mother was the way she was. Anthony saw his suffering as happening because of his parent's and in particular his mother's failures

And I would always blame my mum and my dad for ... for any little thing that happened ...I'd blame them, it's their fault cos they're not together and they don't love me

I: so even when they weren't there you could still blame them

P: yeah I'd blame them for everything

I: also for you feelings as well, you know that deep

P: [interrupts] yeah yeah () if they were here I wouldn't have this feeling you know

I remember crying in the park one day cos some boys were teasing me about my mum ...she's a slut ...she run away with another man you know

And I remember crying in the park that I wouldn't have these feelings if you were here mum (L88)

Between the age of fourteen and seventeen Anthony lived with his brother and his brother's wife. His life seemed to turn around. He describes a warm and loving relationship with his sister-in-law, wherein his emotional world found some calm. He took up boxing and had a dream of becoming a champion. Until nineteen years old he focused on that dream and his life took on a semblance of normalcy. However, at nineteen he became ill and was therefore passed over as a contender for the UK Commonwealth Games boxing team. At the same time he split up with his girlfriend. He interpreted both events as personal rejection and reacted destructively.

... and I didn't have the capacity in my head to deal with it I just went mad ...crazy absolutely...drinkin and fightin...it was horrible (L47)

From this point Anthony became chronically angry and aggressive and could not get over the loss of his girlfriend or his boxing dream. He drank heavily from nineteen years old until forty-two years old, when he sought treatment for alcohol addiction. Much of his adult life and especially between nineteen and thirty years old is characterized by travel, drunken brawls and getting into trouble which often resulted in short stints in jail. He was a Jeckyl and Hyde, changing from a friendly affable character when sober to an 'evil

man' when drunk. He would often black out and not remember what he had done the night before.

This pattern of behavior would last most of Anthony's adult life. Alcohol played a major part in provoking violent situations. His anger would 'come out' when he was drinking and he would be abusive and antagonistic towards people, often without provocation. He was hypersensitive to put downs and criticism and tended to read situations the wrong way. He describes his thoughts in a 'typical' anger- provoking situation

I see kids when I was a wee fella having a dig at me so I want to repay them back because I've got all this knowledge of bruising ...so I would want a revenge sorta you know (L144)

I:so you felt people were having a dig at you. Would you say that you were already sensitive to that?

P: oh hyper-sensitive...I'd be upset about any trivial little thing ...I'd be upset and I'd go and have a beer and someone would say hello to me and I'd take it the wrong way ...and I'd be () [lost for words]My anger would be built up before I went and I'd just let fly (149)

Shame

Like several other chronically angry males interviewees in this study, Anthony had a great deal of trouble defining shame. However, he does reflect what is a common theme in other interviews; that shame involves the violation of standards of conduct in relation to others. He also includes anger as an almost inevitable consequence of shameful actions

...shame to me is when you do something that's not acceptable to others ...you feel angry with yourself ...and your conscience won't let you rest ...yeah shame, that's a real good one, there's all sorts of different shame like [there's] family shame...(L335)

The actual feeling of shame is described by Anthony as 'very ...hurtful' (the repetition of 'very' adding intensity), it is associated with 'low self esteem' and 'feeling worthless'. As a child Anthony said he reacted in many ways to the feeling of shame.

oh yeah I put barriers up, masks on, tried to tell lies ...to cool it down to calm it ...or I'd run away or play soccer ...even when I was 4 or 5 years of age

Anthony had trouble defining shame in words, but there is no doubt that he knows shame intimately. Much of Anthony's shame, it would appear, is bound up with what he refers to as family shame. It involves a violation of codes of conduct and norms by a significant other, in this case his mother. Additionally, it is the public nature of his mother's affair, her abandonment of the family and the public reaction to it that is associated with shame. When asked about family shame Anthony replies

...well it all goes back to early days when mum and dad broke up ...(L339) ...I felt very hurt and very ashamed as well ...cos my mother had another man ...and she didn't hide this ...even to us children she didn't hide this guy ...she was out there ...(L379)

Anthony's understanding of shame is clarified when he describes seeing shame in a friend of his:

...well family shame like bein ashamed of my mum ... like a friend of mine in similar circumstances; the mother was drunk and started taking off all her clothes and he was just a young lad about 9 or 10 ...you know you could feel the shame that he had, you could see it ...tears comin down his eyesI knew how he was feelin ...the hurt the pain, you could see the pain on his face

I: so that was a similar feeling that you had when your mum was openly with this other guy

P: yeah ...exactly the same ...I was looking at myself (L428)

But Anthony's shame was not only felt through direct experience. The teasing of children outside the family also provided it. Anthony describes the taunting as 'very

hurtful' and as happening over many years. Anthony was being shamed by others, yet there was nothing he could do about it, because the source of the shame was irrefutable on one hand, and so very public, on the other. In addition Anthony was living in his uncles house so there was nowhere he could escape the pain he felt. He tried to run away from his uncle's; he asked to go to another school (and was refused) and sought comfort in the church. But there was no relief until he went to stay with his brother and wife.

In the stable environment of his brother's house, Anthony's feelings of self-efficacy increased as did a sense of pride in himself. He was treated well and respected, but in the end he left because of his brother's involvement in drug dealing. He describes his brother as a 'real hard man' and a 'heavy dude', and tells of shotguns 'lying around the house'. This was out of Anthony's league.

There is evidence in the text of a sense of personal shame persisting throughout Anthony's life. He makes several references to the effect that as an adult he had feelings of both anger and shame that he just couldn't get rid of. Anthony's relationship to shame is also demonstrated in clear terms when talking about his reasons for becoming a champion boxer

... I didn't want to be a professional [boxer] I just wanted to be a champion you know, I had goals of being a champ that was my dreamNo one would ever hurt me and shame me into anything ...That's the feeling I had ...If I'm good enough nobody will be able to hurt me! Cos I'll do them, I'll shut them up you know (L286)

Anthony's agenda was intimately bound up with shame, and silencing those who would put shame onto him. The above also helps to explain Anthony's destructive reaction to missing out on a place in the Commonwealth Games Boxing Team. From a state of pride and hope he was knocked back to a state of shame and hopelessness.

So far it is possible to identify several sources of shame. First there is shame, which was put onto Anthony by others, mainly the children who teased him and his uncle; second there is shame that is caused by someone else's actions or behavior. Anthony was not responsible for his mother's actions, yet he felt ashamed of what she had done.

Thirdly there is shame from his own actions. This was more implicit in the text than explicit and revolved around getting drunk and fighting. These episodes were always talked about with a bit of a smile as if to suggest that the participant was not wholly accountable for his actions because alcohol was involved. Also, Anthony is proud of his ability to fight, and equally proud of the fact that he saw himself as fearless. So it is likely that the shame associated with his anger has a more intellectual quality as opposed to the shame that is 'felt'. The difference here can be illustrated as 'I felt shame' (shame about mother) and 'I should be ashamed of my actions' (drinking and fighting).

This researcher was also interested in the way shame witnessed in others may affect anger. As mentioned Anthony describes seeing shame in his 10-year-old friend. Anthony was asked how this made him feel. His response was one of empathy and he remembered feeling 'pity', and that he felt close to his friend because he knew the pain he was experiencing. Through shame Anthony could understand him.

Three years before the interview, Anthony's family was called together by his mother because she was dying of cancer. She had some things she wanted to put right before she died. She explained her actions and behavior relating to the time she left her family, and asked Anthony's forgiveness. She took responsibility for her actions, putting them in a perspective Anthony himself could understand through his own experience. She felt ashamed she had bestowed shame on her children and that they had suffered for it. Anthony describes the feeling of seeing his mother's shame in the following terms:

I: ...how did your mothers' shame make you feel?

P: it made (2) it took (2) it made me feel really wonderful actually (2) it brought a calming effect (2) it's very hard to explain (2) it was a brilliant peacefulness (2) that she was honest, no holds barred, told me everything (2) and I could see the shame, the hurt, the anguish in her face (2) tears in her eyes (2) yeah it was a wonderful feeling at the time ...(L454)

Anthony explains how he had waited for this moment, hoped for it, prayed for it, knew he needed to experience it.

P: I used to pray that mum would come out one day and explain it and say I'm sorry for what I've done (2) you know (2) I prayed for that (2) incredible aye. It took a lot of years but it did happen (L461)

He goes on to explain that his awareness of his mother's role in his process only became apparent as an adult. As a teenager he reflects that he would have needed it and it would have made a difference, but implies that he wasn't cognisant of it as an actual conscious need. As a child he simply wished it had never happened.

I: was that as a kid ?

P: ahh (2) as a kid I wished that it had never happened (2) ok (2) I wished that never happened and that I could run away ...and get well away from it ...it was only as an adult that I wanted it (2) do you know what I mean? I wanted mum to say this is how it was (2) can you understand how I was and forgive me (2) and it happened

I: did you 'need' it as in a real need for it?

P: I did I did (2) I needed that to give me the inner peace that I was searchin for (L464)

Shame and Anger

Anthony has reported both shame and anger as far back as 4 and 5 years old. From his present standpoint he understands that the two are interrelated but cannot articulate the relationship. When asked which one he thought came first, he said shame was first and it 'ignited anger' (L370). What becomes clear from the preceding section is that where there is shame there is anger and vice versa.

Beginning in childhood, Anthony is conscious of feeling shame for his mother's behavior. It was hurtful to see her openly engaging with another man. About this he describes the vague memory of feeling hurt, confused and of having a desperate wish that it wasn't happening. In order to cope with his feelings, attempts were made to 'cool things down' and reinterpret the situation. Within Nathanson's (1992) compass of shame, the script being formed had the characteristics of avoidance. This defense strategy is associated with a 'repudiation of reality', or minimizing and shifting the focus away from

that which causes shame. It is intimately bound to the more widely recognized strategies of denial and disavowal (p. 337).

It is not known for how long Anthony was exposed to his mother's 'infidelity', or indeed whether this was the only shame-oriented situation he had experienced. It is assumed here that it was not an isolated event and that Anthony's way of coping with shame affect was quite well rehearsed, even at 5 years old.

When Anthony began to experience the teasing and ridicule of others, he acted from the *attack other script*. It is the strategy most closely associated with anger, and the elevation of the self through the devaluation of others. This script was formed on the basis of changing the feeling of humiliation and shame by attacking those that he saw as delivering, and making public the message that he desperately wanted to keep secret. This is not to say that the teasing and humiliation was the locus of Anthony's rage, even though while he was young and un-accepting of his family's defects, those who teased him received his complete angry attention.

The environment Anthony was in sanctioned violence, and its effectiveness was sharpened by his brother's involvement. They operated as a gang, and were able to 'instill fear' into other kids by their ferocity. But as Anthony says, it silenced the enemy, but only for a 'wee while'. The humiliation was recurring over many years. But underlying Anthony's anger was an overwhelmingly desperate feeling of hurt and pain, which endured for most of his life. As Anthony suggests, the humiliation brought this feeling into sharp awareness, and was temporarily soothed by attacking what he saw as its cause.

Both mother and father had abandoned Anthony and his brothers. If he did not feel unloved by his parents at that time, the seed had at least been planted. Added to this was a whole raft of associated thoughts and feelings, which are identified in the text. These include; feeling unwanted, feeling unimportant and unworthy of love and respect. These ideas were nourished when Anthony went to live with his uncle. In this relationship, Anthony was forcefully restricted in his range of defenses against being shamed. His uncle was big, powerful, and in total control of those around him. It is possible that he distanced himself from his own sense of shame at what his sister had done by heaping it onto Anthony. In this situation, Anthony's only option for coping was the script of withdrawal. The withdrawal script is associated with the desire to escape or disappear from view, and,

in Nathanson's (1992) model, it is likely to be co-assembled with the auxiliary affects of fear and distress (p. 313). Interestingly, at no point in the interview does Anthony express a longstanding resentment towards his uncle. What he is emphatic about is being fearful of him.

For Anthony it seems there was very little respite from the shame others would heap onto him. The constant messages he received from his uncle and peers were that he was a scourge. He internalized these messages and reports a pervading feeling of 'worthlessness' lasting most of his life. He came to expect that people saw him this way and read social interactions as such. His repertoire of defense came to rely more and more on violence, which was fuelled by a growing sense of hatred both for himself and those who perpetuated his sense of shame. By puberty he reports that he was 'out of control' and that he had a complete lack of consideration for himself and others. Having had searched and found no relief, no passage out of his suffering, he simply stopped caring.

Why was there no one there to protect Anthony? He decided it was because his parents didn't love him, and that ultimately they were responsible for his suffering. He blamed them because he knew he didn't deserve what he got, and that he deserved what he didn't get. He describes the anguish he felt when he saw other kids in loving, caring families. These feelings would fall under the umbrella of shame-based affect in Nathanson's (1992) theory.

By adolescence Anthony had found a way to potentially allay his sense of shame. His newfound prowess in boxing was a means to gain respect both for himself and from others. This strategy can be seen as a modification of the avoidance script already mentioned, and is based around achievement of status. If Anthony could become good enough he could beat anyone who dared to shame him. For the period between fourteen and nineteen years old, Anthony built up a considerable trophy cabinet. He took pride in his efforts. Nathanson (1992) refers to this kind of pride, which is earned through achievement and a need to win, as 'false pride' (p. 351-353). During this phase of achievement Anthony reports that he wasn't angry and that he felt good about himself. His anger returned in a powerful way when his chances of winning glory were quashed through illness. He also lost his girlfriend round that time. He blamed the Amateur Boxing

Association (ABA) for his demise and put it down to the fact that, because he was Scottish and the ABA favored English boxers, he was passed over.

Anthony looks back on the ensuing period with considerable shame. He was now caught up in the shame/rage cycle. He drank, got involved in bar fights, felt ashamed, got angry, and drank and fought etc. He was actively doing things and behaving in a way that brought him shame, as opposed to having shame heaped on him. His self-loathing developed to new levels, which added urgency to the need to reduce those around him to a lower level than himself. Anthony admits that he derived a feeling of satisfaction from his violence, often taking on people much bigger than himself. He brings up the notion that maybe his motivation was to shame these people, thus enacting a transfer of shame from him to them. But the relief was temporary. The *attack other* pattern just outlined may be characterized as; I shamed you therefore I'm better than you. It is an attempt to give balance to the shame/pride axis. It may also be seen as forcing shame onto others or giving it away.

So far the relationship between shame and anger appears to be that shame gives rise to anger and/or serves to escalate and maintain it. A broad distinction has been made between shame which is genuinely felt because of the violation of certain standards and norms, and, shame that has put onto a person, but which that person feels is unjustified. The former is associated with anger at one's self as a result of judgment of oneself by oneself. In the latter case, anger is directed to at an external source of judgment and is intensified by the perceived wrongness of the judgment. The two share the same affective mechanism but are driven by different scripts, which give rise to different emotional and behavioral patterns.

From childhood through to adulthood Anthony talks of being aware of searching for some kind of relief from his negative feelings. As an adult he said he knew he needed something from his mother, some honest contact. At worst it could be an explanation, at best, her love. It is argued here that among Anthony's needs was the need to witness his mother's shame and regret over her abandonment of him and his subsequent suffering. Anthony is aware that he was ashamed of his mother, and that the shaming he experienced was in large part a consequence of her actions. He describes the feeling he had at the time

of his mother's apology as 'profound' and also 'peaceful' and 'calming'. He describes the effect it had on him in terms of a 'release' and a dark cloud disappearing.

Because her apology had a substantial shame element to it, Anthony was able to truly forgive her, not just intellectually but emotionally as well. He surmises that because of the stage he was at in his personal development, he was ready for a major life change. But he never expected the depth of change that was made possible by this meeting with his mother. The gnawing chronic anger has subsequently abated, and he has given up alcohol. On the subject of alcohol and anger, Anthony discloses that even though a lot of his violence was committed while drunk, it was his negative feelings, principally anger and shame, that predisposed him to drink.

Case Study # 2: Andrew

Andrew is 33 years old, about 6 feet tall and powerfully built. His posture and gesture suggest a very physical person. He left school at 15 with no formal qualification and has had no formal vocational training. He is currently employed full time. He is divorced, is presently in a casual relationship, and has 3 children under 10 years who he looks after every second weekend. Andrew has a history of drug abuse including solvent abuse (glue and petrol). He also has a violent history. He has never been to jail and has no history of criminality.

Andrew was an accommodating participant and was enthusiastic about the interview, to the point that he allowed himself to be interviewed on 3 separate occasions. Andrew had in the last 3 years done an anger management course, which he said had changed his life. He was a 'new person' now and to a certain extent saw the interview as an occasion to share this 'new Andrew'. He was oriented to the present and future, which was at odds with information necessary to the research project.

Andrew seemed a fairly cheerful energetic person. However during the interview his mood shifted quite radically. There was a strong correlation between his mood and whether he was talking about now or when he was young. He was happy when talking about his present life, and ranged between sad, angry and shamed when talking about aspects of his childhood. The interview was made emotionally dynamic for both participants because of Andrew's tendency to rebound from talking about painful past events to present unrelated events. Metaphorically the present acted as a magnet for Andrew and the bulk of the transcript is taken up with what is going right in his life now and how this affects him. In this context answers to historically relevant questions were answered briefly. Attention will now be turned to the transcript and analysis of shame and anger. Anger will be dealt with first followed by shame. An analysis of their interrelationship will follow.

Anger

Andrew is the oldest of 3 children. His family life as a child appears to have been dysfunctional and chaotic. He left home at 15. Andrew's parents separated when he was 17. His father left his mother for another woman with whom he left the country. Andrew's father was a mechanic and worked for the Railways for 34 years. Materially he provided more than adequately for the family – 'new house, nice car, video games' etc.. Andrew describes him as a 'hard worker'. But his father was also extremely controlling and Andrew saw him as 'powerful', a person 'to be feared'. He describes him as a very angry and violent man who was extremely abusive towards children and mother alike. Andrew was and still is very close to his mother and talks affectionately about her. Andrew's anger is associated with his father.

Within the family context Andrew is conscious of having high levels of anger from 10 years old until he left home. There are also several references to his fearfulness as a young child. Andrew was bullied and victimized at school, because he was seen as a rich kid in a tough school. At home he lived in fear of his father who would fly into angry rages over trivial things, throwing tools, 'punching holes in cupboards' and 'screaming'. As a child Andrew learned to keep out of his father's way and not to annoy him

...you couldn't go out with dad in the car because we were scared to ...if anything went wrong with the car he'd rip the bonnet off ...he was a powerful man (517)

... I had a cricket wicket thrown at me once ...I must have said something ...and he had it in his hand [the wicket] and I thought that's going to hit me so I started running ...and it just flew past me ...and it had a metal tip on it ...(L377)

But from around 10 years old Andrew recounts his difficulty in coming to terms with his father's often bizarre and strange behavior. Special social occasions such as Christmas or a Sunday drive were routinely ruined by his father's aggression, and obsession with fixing his car:

and [the car] was all loaded up in the boot with like Christmas presents you know (2)
hundreds and hundreds of dollars worth ofpresents and we were going through the

Buller gorge and dad heard some noise that the car was making ... the car sort of come to a grinding halt ... he opened the boot, half the ..presents fell outon the side of the road, and when we got there ... half the presents weren't there (L23)

Andrew attributes his own anger to his father's cruel and sadistic treatment of Andrew's mother. Andrew talks about his mother's life with his father as being 'a living hell'. He found it very difficult to talk about what he had witnessed in the family. What he chose to disclose are but a few examples from a very painful past:

...between 10 and 15 it was just anger ...like I couldn't understand in my mind how a person could be so mean ... like Dad was such a mean person you know (L519)

His father had many affairs and Andrew's mother became sick with STDs brought home by his father. He remembers his father coming home drunk and 'forcing himself' on her. As a child Andrew saw his mother being 'dragged around the house', saw his father hitting his mother. He saw his mother put her fist through a window out of desperation and cut her artery. His father committed Andrew's mother to a mental institution on 4 separate occasions. Andrew came to believe that his father was manipulating his mother's emotions to 'get her out of the way' so that he could have his affairs.

Andrew was 15 when his mother was committed for the last time. In anger he drew an effigy of his father, hung it on his wardrobe door and shot at it with his father's .22 caliber rifle.

that was not long after he put Mum into a mental institution and I think he sort of thrived on [it] [quoting father] 'I've put [mothers name] in [mental hospital] you know', and by putting her in [mental hospital] it gave him that open field to go and do what he wanted to do ... cos Mum was out of the scene (6) yeah and then I drew the target and (2) took my anger out on it aye ...really it was basically well ... you bastard sort of thing why the hell did you do it I would have killed him ...if he had have walked in at that time I had that gun (2) I would have killed him... (L254)

The depth of feeling towards his father is evidenced in Andrew's demeanor while telling this story. His lips become whitish and begin to quiver. He stares in a trance like state out the window as if in his own world. Also his nose blocks and his eyes become glazed and watery, and his face becomes pale. His speech slows and becomes hesitant, with pauses between words noticeably longer and more frequent. The impression is of a mixture of emotions including anger, sadness and pain. The change is so striking that it is like being in the presence of a different person than 5 minutes before.

In the early part of his life, Andrew's range of coping strategies included avoiding spending time at home, integrating himself into 'normal' family systems of friends, and escape through drugs. By the time he was 15, Andrew had a history of heavy solvent abuse, including glue and petrol. This graduated into the more conventional drug and alcohol abuse as he got older. From his early teens onwards Andrew also used violence to solve perceived conflicts. He states that up until 5 years ago fighting was a normal part of his life. Both Andrew and his brother have physically assaulted their father and his brother tried to burn his house down. He describes dragging another man from his house and beating him on his own front lawn for some minor transgression. Often it was about what he thought someone was thinking about him.

Andrew also took his anger and violence into his marriage. While he claims not to have beaten his wife, he would act out as his father did smashing everything in the living room, TV, stereo etc, screaming and threatening his wife physically (with a poker, on one occasion) and spitting on her. In hindsight Andrew draws a strong parallel between his father's actions and his own. In many ways he idealized his father and reports internalizing the efficacy of his father's methods in dealing with conflicts or problems. Through his anger and violence his father instilled fear into his wife and children, thereby maintaining control over them. Andrew adopted this way of operating because it was all he knew:

My father was sort of a violent person (4) dunno why but very angry (2) yeah us kids got the flack of it you know and ah (2) sort of carried it on into our relationships ...because we sort of thought that it was ... (2) a normal thing [emphasis] ...5 years ago I would go out looking for scraps all the time um (2) because I thought it was a normal part of everyday life cos that's what I've seen ...I've seen dad pull things to bits with his bare hands um you know

Even though Andrew has moved on and taken responsibility for his violence and aggression, he still has deep feelings of anger towards his father. He introduces the metaphor of carrying feelings such as grief, anger and shame around in a bag over his shoulders. As feelings are 'unleashed' or let go and dealt with, the bag gets lighter. Although he reports that he has released a lot of feelings and dealt with a lot of issues, the anger towards his father is all that remains unresolved in his 'bag':

...and doing this interview is like emptying out me bag but there's stuff in my bag with Dad that will never ever empty out (2) well he's the only one that's got the ... the last key to that padlock basically and and could put that key in and turn it and it will open and then he's got to unleash ... he's got a lot of answering to do basically and there's a lot of hurt still there (L507)

Shame

Andrew found it very difficult to talk about shame in relation to himself. After manually sorting the text into various categories it was found that self-references using shame took up no more than 10 lines out of the transcribed 320 lines. It is estimated that at least another 100 lines of irrelevant text was edited out at transcription. Characteristic statements were,

I: was there any shame attached to that whole ... era, to do with your father?

P: yeah, there's a lot of shame [P begins to look intense and upset]

I: you don't have to talk about this if you don't want to

P: no there's a lot of shame there's a lot of shame, oh no no it's fine, a lot of shame

There was a lot of hurt, and a lot of anger and a lot of mixed emotions (228)

In the second interview Andrew has a great deal of difficulty defining shame. Interestingly, he alluded to the self-orientation and the ubiquity of shame in his own life. He also mentions that the experience of shame sets one aside from other people, and associates it with being forced to hide himself physically as well as emotionally:

P: well shame is um (2) pitying yourself basically ...having a low tolerance in yourself which is you're afraid to do things I suppose that other people normally do. That's a hard question. You can go into a lot of areas ...

When asked about shame in relation to himself Andrew makes clear that his understanding of shame relates to being ashamed of his actions and behavior:

...well shame to me well (2) I'm ashamed of what I've done like ...[it's] basically the situation I'm in at the moment ...I'm ashamed of what I did and I lost a 12 year marriage because of what I did and I'm ashamed of that so ...I mean that's the only sort of shame I can relate to ...you could break that shame down into 50,000 areas I suppose ...my shame basically is for my kids because my kids wanted a family upbringing and now they've got a separated family upbringing ...so basically that's shame to me (L332)

Even though Andrew has difficulty defining it, he shows a deep understanding of shame's essential elements. Not only is it about actions, but it is also about him as a person. There is the sense that he is now ashamed of the 'Andrew of old', who acted badly. What is not so clear is whether he was ashamed of himself at the time.

...and I'm ashamed of the person I used to be, I'm not the person I used to be now ...[then my feelings about myself] ...were hidden away ... I was very much hidden away ...I was probably ashamed of myself to go out in public because of what I'd done ...you know I used to go out and get into a lot of shit [little laugh] and I look back on that now and I am ashamed of what I did then ... (L339)

For Andrew the experience of shame is explicitly linked with disappearing and staying out of sight. When talking about his youth he talks about seeing things he didn't like within the family that made him feel ashamed.

...there's a lot of shame in the respect that what I've seen I've taken in and I didn't like (2) and um I've sort of hid myself away you know ...

Shame in this context takes on a more abstract quality. It is a lot more difficult for Andrew to express. In order to understand more fully, it is necessary to go back to Andrew as a child. As mentioned above he was bullied at primary school. This came to light when Andrew was asked how he felt about himself as a child:

... I can relate to that. As a child I didn't really look at myself as being anybody (2) um I got called names ... I think it was a kid thing back then ... all sorts of different names ...I had curly hair so I got called 'golly wog' ...but I just kept that to myself and sort of worked through it ...(L359)

He was then asked how his father related to him:

I: ... how was it with your Dad? How did he talk to you?

P: well Dad was a very very hard man (2) that's the only way I could describe him like he'd go and buy a new car ...and it would make one single noise and he'd rip the whole car to bits to find it and you'd get in his way while he was doin that and you'd have [spanners] thrown at you ...or clout you round the ear ...(L369)

Several other direct questions about the way Andrew and his father interacted were answered in the same indirect fashion. Andrew begins to open up about his own impression of his father when asked if he thought his father was fair or unfair towards him:

... yeah in some cases oh how can I put it (2) he was the loving dad when he wanted to be but most of the time he was more tied up with work ...he was a very knowledgeable guy ...and I think he in a way is ashamed of us you know ... if any body is ashamed it should be the old man because he basically shamed me and [brother] cos we were out fighting all the time and we were always in the shit ...

I: he shamed you?

P: yeah he did ... well just probably embarrassed of us kids ... he made us ...sowed the seed ...like he was very close to my sister but me and [brother] were like outcasts like

we didn't exist in the family if you know what I mean ...in his scheme of things ...Mum was very much there [for us] all the time (L397)

Here Andrew is talking in the past tense, about the 'old Andrew. He felt rejected by his father. Twice during the interview Andrew says that he didn't have a father in the true sense. In the early part of his life it was because his father was never there for him. In the last 17 years it is because his father has not contacted any of his children even though they have made numerous attempts at contacting him. He literally vanished out of their lives.

Andrew felt that he didn't matter to his father, that he wasn't important. What was important for his father, according to Andrew, was his life outside the family, as well as material things such as cars and tools. Furthermore, Andrew did not feel his father loved him. He describes himself as a loveable child who craved his father's love. This 'need' is still there for Andrew as the following illustrates:

yeah and all he's got to acknowledge to me today is his love and I mean if he can't acknowledge his love and his love for the grandkids, well he's no father of mine and I'd say that to him as hard as it sounds ...(L495)

Andrew's fear of his father, his father's aggression towards him, his father's absence from the family, have all informed Andrew about his father's feelings towards him. These are not isolated incidents but rather patterns of behavior happening over many years. Thus his father's behavior and feelings became predictable to Andrew. His father's rejection of him became his reality and was internalized as such. Whether it was understood by Andrew in terms of shame, or seen as an absence of love from his father towards him and his brother, it generated a painful sense of shame in Andrew.

The quality of shame just outlined is more in line with shame that is put onto a person, as opposed to shame that derives from one's own actions. Andrew sees himself as 'innocent' and therefore undeserving of the shame he felt because of the family context. From the perspective of the 'new Andrew', it is his father who should feel shame and not him. A discussion about witnessing shame in others was preempted when Andrew explored the hypothetical concept of 'getting rid' of the source of his anger. He was asked,

I: so how do you get rid of that then? What would it take in your life to get rid of that anger?

P: ...for him to come to terms with himself, look at himself and realize that he's the person he was ... um not so much what he is now ...unleash his shame to us kids and what he did over that period of our growing up life ... (L460)

Anger and Shame

Andrew is not conscious of the connection between anger and shame, nor is he inclined towards theorizing such a connection. Although he is reluctant to associate shame with himself as a child, he does disclose that he never thought of himself as anybody - that is, he didn't count, wasn't important, particularly in reference to his father. His recollection of their relationship is one of distance and rejection, yet in Andrews' eyes, his father was a hero – strong intelligent and in control.

Andrew never got the love and attention from his father, his hero. This is not a momentary situation, but rather a pattern that has persisted for Andrew's entire life. Andrew's relationship with his father was so utterly shaming for him that he simply withdrew himself emotionally. His self-esteem was low and his intellectual world shut down, which manifested itself in extreme learning difficulties in school. Withdrawal is an unlearned pre-programmed shame response according to Nathanson (1992). Therefore it was not a choice Andrew made, but a pre-scripted pattern unique to the affect shame. Withdrawal scripts are likely to be co-assembled with the affects fear and distress, and Andrew reports more or less constant exposure to both in his childhood.

Nathanson's (1992) theory accommodates the complexity of interpersonal interaction, and the competing tensions that are rife, particularly in parent/child relationships. Therefore he does not suggest that one script only may be in effect at any one time. Even though Andrew reports fearing his father, he also needed and craved his love and approval. There is a powerful tension here, which, when taken in the context of the compass of shame, suggests that Andrew remained emotionally 'open' to his fathers love.

The *attack self script* is a pattern, which tends towards 'relating to others in ways that guarantee affiliation ...at a reduced level of self-esteem' (Nathanson, 1992, p. 332).

As a child Andrew wanted his father's attention but was constantly shamed and frustrated in his efforts either through his father's outright rejection and abuse of him, or his unavailability. In this context it is easy to conjecture a steady elevation of anger in Andrew for the same reason, for example, an adult employee will develop resentment towards a boss who rewards their efforts with indifference and negativity.

Another powerful source of shame and distress in Andrew's childhood was the witnessing of his father's abuse of his mother. This involved the routine degradation of his mother, with whom Andrew has a deep and loving bond. Andrew associates this period with a confusion of emotions, including shame and anger. He was ashamed of the way his family functioned, of the violence and abuse, which characterized the way his father operated. He compares his family to other loving and functional families and the way his friend's father took Andrew under his wing and was 'more of a father' to him than his own. This kind of family shame is not traceable to an event, but rather to a way of being, or a pattern, the elements of which violate the codes and norms of family life. Andrew avoided bringing attention to his family by hiding himself away and disappearing into himself. He said he never talked about what he saw in his family, he just kept it to himself.

There was of course no logical way Andrew could resolve the inner turmoil and tension he experienced as a child. It is likely that the suppressive/repressive effect that fear had on anger created in Andrew a time bomb. Andrew remembers the explosion occurring at around 10 years old. Between 10 and 15 years old, Andrew says all he can remember is anger. He used solvents as a temporary escape, and began to use violence. He also began to operate from the attack other 'library of scripts', which incorporated an increase in aggression towards his father. This script may involve revenge and retribution.

On a more emotional level, this may involve 'turning the tables' with the ultimate goal being the shaming of others. This was the period in which Andrew confronted his father about his affairs and came close to shooting him because he blamed him for causing his mother's depressive illness and subsequent hospitalization. More generally this was a time when Andrew went out and got into 'all kinds of [trouble]', much of it involving violence. He was angry with his father because he had brought shame into the whole family, yet Andrew also acknowledges the parallels between his behavior and his father's.

Andrew was also ashamed of his father for infidelity. His effort at shame reduction in this respect is linked to an *avoidance script*, which involves a reinterpretation of perceptions. This is evidenced in Andrew's inference that it was not his father's fault he was having an affair, rather it was his mistress who was consciously trying to 'lure' him away. At one point during the interview Andrew says that most of his anger 'was' directed at the woman his father left the family for, because 'she took Dad away from the family'.

Up to this point, the source of Andrew's shame can be characterized as external, despite being felt as if it came from within. Even though Andrew felt it as such, the source of the shame came from without. That is, it was put onto him by others, and is therefore associated with a sense of injustice. But through his violent and anti-social behavior, Andrew began to accumulate a sense of shame brought about by his actions. This is especially true of his domestic situation, wherein he operated in the same way as his father.

He characterizes his behavior towards his wife as 'exactly' like his father, including the 'spitting ...smashing of things ...and threatening' of his wife. *He* was now the head of the family, and exercised his liberty in that role to the detriment of all concerned. He was caught having an affair and the family 'ideal' disintegrated. It seems that Andrew was drawing on an *avoidance script* as he moved toward modifying his sense of self and identity within the family context. In Andrew's case, this strategy is associated with narcissism and an elevating of one's self- image through various means such as, the role of fatherhood, the role of husband, hard worker and more dangerously, the role of lover.

Through his own indulgence, Andrew had lost his family. He had let his children down and the shame from this steered him towards change. He describes feeling ashamed and angry with himself to the point where he tried to commit suicide. After counselling and various other self-help strategies, such as anger management and stop violence, he has made considerable advances.

In spite of this, Andrew admits to a chronic and deep anger towards his father. A theme that emerges is link between his anger and his father's rejection of him. Andrew was rejected as a child and inevitably developed a view of himself as not being good enough, not worthy of his father's attention. This gives rise to a shamed disposition. As an adult his father vanished from Andrew's life and he sees this as an extension of early rejection. Thus Andrew has lived, and still lives, in a constant state of rejection by his father.

Through careful analysis of the way in which Andrew talks about his father and himself, several dichotomous themes emerge. One involves Andrew's father as a hero, and the other as a sadistic tyrant. The first construct is associated with Andrew's love and admiration for his father (he is 'clever' and 'powerful' etc), and, what he feels to be his father's rejection of him (...Dad had a right to feel ashamed of me ...because I don't deserve his respect). Also there is the disavowal of Andrew's father being responsible for Andrew's shame and anguish as a child and adult. In this view it's mostly Andrew's fault that he suffered, because he is bad, defective, and as a result, his anger is directed at himself.

The opposite set of ideas involves Andrew's father as manipulative and a 'rotten scumbag'. This view involves the lucid recollection of his father's sadism, diminution, and abuse of Andrew and the resulting hurt and shame. There is also the realization that Andrew was unimportant to his father and the reasons for his rejection emanate from his father's defective self. It was his problem and not Andrew's. Within this perspective Andrew is a proud and worthy person, which manifests itself in healthy relationships to the world, including his children. The anger and resentment in this domain is bitter and is directed at his father.

In the latter configuration, the only shame that belongs to Andrew is that which he earned through his actions. In Andrew's view, much of the rest of the shame in his life was unfairly put onto him by his father. It is argued here that this is the core or foundational source of Andrew's anger. Andrew postulates that to resolve this anger, his father needs to apologize, in a way that shows Andrew that his father is ashamed of how he treated him and the rest of the family.

Andrew represents this with imagery, which depicts him spending his life in a prison created by the father, who is the only one who holds the key to his release. Andrew believes that his father's expression of shame and guilt for the years of abuse and neglect would allow him to forgive his father, and therefore allow him to let go of the bitter sense of anger and the underlying feeling of shame.

Case Study #3: Albert

Albert is 43 years old, and of medium build. He is living with a long-term partner with whom he has one child. He also has part-time care of a son from a previous marriage and his present partner has 2 teenage children whom Albert has had a significant role in raising. He left school at 15 with no formal qualification and completed a builder's apprenticeship. He has worked as a builder for most of his working life. He is currently self-employed and engaged in casual employment. Albert has a history alcohol and drug abuse as well as violence. He sought treatment 10 years ago, after which time he stopped drinking and moderated his drug use and violence. He has no history of criminality.

Albert comes across as a physical man who is very sure of himself in the physical world. This physical intensity is also matched by an intellectual curiosity and Albert has very strong opinions on many subjects. His demeanor was pleasant yet there was an air of defensiveness about him. He weighed his answers thoughtfully and was capable of deep insight. To this end, many of his answers were very long and complex, and at times drifted off the subject. Content analysis shows that on the subject of shame he seemed ill at ease especially when talking about personal shame. He was overtly resistant to the idea that shame may have influenced his life-path in any way.

Shame was spoken about specifically (that is, in direct reference to questions asked) for approximately 50 of the 524 lines of the interview, and of these, over half involved rhetorical questions, many of which were concerned with the meaning of shame; what it is? Is it ...?. Albert speaks very rapidly and forcefully. This, in combination with the complexity of his thought and length of answers, made it difficult to intervene with questions. Thus the number of questions asked was 32, resulting in an average of about 15 lines per answer. This is the highest average for all 16 interviews conducted.

During the course of the interview Albert expressed a range of emotions including, anger, grief and despair. There were also instances of 'black humor', many of which were associated with traumatic situations. Much of the interview was taken up with things that make Albert angry, and he did, to varying degrees, become angry when talking about these.

Anger

Albert is the second youngest of 7 children. His mother was overtly religious and his father's job meant that he spent much of his life away from the family. Albert describes him as a hard-drinking, hard-working, hard-fighting, quietly spoken man. His job meant that he was away for weeks at a time, and when he was home, he spent much of this time in the pub drinking whiskey. Albert reports that his father never hit the children nor was he abusive in any other way towards them. He was a man of high standing in the local community, and was seen as a hero by Albert and his younger brother. Albert remembers his father as verbally uncommunicative, never giving his children praise or encouragement. Yet he always felt loved by his father and without words knew his father was proud of him. Albert did and still does see his father as a hero.

The relationship between Albert's parents was hostile and verbally abusive. When Albert's father would come home he was often drunk, and Albert remembers many bitter arguments between them. Albert says that although his father was 'verbally violent' towards his mother, he was never physically violent toward her. Albert recalls that his mother was unhappy in the relationship and that she was often verbally abusive and antagonistic towards his father. She would decry her husband as a 'useless bastard' and she would provoke and humiliate him in front of Albert.

Albert's anger is directed at his mother. From the present day perspective he sees both of his parents as contributing to the trouble, but it was his mother's treatment of both himself and his father, which Albert associates with anger. His mother was abusive to all but the eldest of her children, but by the time Albert was 9 years old, only he and his younger brother remained at home, and the abuse towards them intensified. Albert sees himself as bearing the full impact of his mother's frustration and anger for her husband. It is from the period of around 7 and 8 years old that Albert is conscious of anger.

...most of the ... anger that I've ever ...had in my life actually, came from a period long before I was ever kind of cognizant of ... what was right and what was bloody wrong ...(L67)

I was just ... totally pissed off with it all because it was unjust or even at the age of 7 I knew it was unjust but I didn't know what was unjust about it ... (L41)

Here Albert identifies injustice as source of his anger. There are two identifiable areas of injustice within the text. They elicit easily observable and elevated levels of emotionality (mainly anger) in Albert when discussed. Both involve Albert's mother. First, his mother subjected Albert to physical abuse over a long period of time. The abuse involved regular physical beating, and occurred between 7 and 14 years of age. Albert recalls that his mother had violent mood swings, which he attributes partly to the fact that she was addicted to and a heavy user of Valium. She was unpredictable and would fly into a rage for no apparent reason. Albert's younger brother took part in the pilot study for the present study. He characterizes his mother as 'beating me one minute and cuddling me the next'. He said he never knew what was coming next or how to make sense of the extremes in his mother's behavior.

The injustice for Albert is that both the physical and verbal violence he received was generally undeserved. It was not measured and deserved punishment; rather it was random and extremely violent. Although Albert has the persona of a fearless and 'hard nosed' individual, he recounts experiencing excessive fear in relation to his mother, as a child

she used to beat me so [bloody] much that it was terrifying to go home ... and it was terrifying to come out of my room ... it was terrifying to be in the house alone with her ... I was terrified to pass the kitchen the fridge because it had sharp edges on it and she'd bash [hell] out of it with my brain ... it was terrifying to open the door into the kitchen when she called because ... generally she only called so she could scream at ya and ...batter [hell] out of ya and (8)... (4) and (4) because I'm tuff (2) and my Dad was tough (2) I didn't forgive her (2) I just (2) let it go as in (2) that's what happened (2) and I wondered if (2) other peoples (2) mother's did the same(8) (L477)

Albert began to experiment with drugs and alcohol at around 11-12 years old. He also learned to fight around this time, which was not so unusual for boys in his community.

But he recalls that his mastery and use of violence had stepped up a level by the time he was 14. Violence became a tool with which to defend himself against perceived ill treatment by teachers at school and it also gained him a reputation as someone to be feared and respected by peers. Until leaving the country at 23 years old, Albert had developed 'his' violence to an extent that it was part of his identity within his community. He was a 'Jake the muss' of his town.

It is important at this point to make a distinction between Albert's anger and his violence. According to Albert, he was angry from around 7 or 8 years old, but he describes himself as turning into a violent person around the age of 13 or 14. Albert did not simply react with violence in a moment of rage; he often used violence in an instrumental way, and cultivated skills through experience. In his own words he 'excelled in violence'. He attained a level of control of the violent situation, to the point where he adopted his own protocols and manners for violence:

...I was always polite (4) even before I ... dealt to someone I was always polite to them [said in low monotone voice] I never showed or I was never insolent to someone who was looking for a hiding ...I was (2) quite nice about it (2) until I ... got em [makes whistling sound] ...(L304)

As well as being physically abused Albert underwent prolonged verbal and psychological abuse by his mother. Albert recalls that his mother constantly compared him to his father in a derogatory way; Albert was like his father; he was useless and a 'Scots bastard'. Albert maintains that this wasn't really a problem because his father was a hero to him. Nevertheless Albert felt himself put down and attacked by his mother. His animosity towards his mother grew as he realized that she treated him so badly because she could not 'get to' his father:

I knew why (2) that was the ... thing that got me (2) I knew why... because she couldn't get my old man (L501) ... yeah oh there was no way in the world that she could get near him... he was a big strong man...(L515)

His mother also compared Albert negatively to his oldest brother, who was regarded within the family and community as clever and likely to succeed. His oldest brother was everything that Albert would never be. His brother was the favorite son of Albert's mother, and Albert was 'a disease'. Albert says that he grew up with 'this stuff'. It was constant and ongoing. His oldest brother was 15 years older than Albert, and not of the same father. Although he left when Albert was 7, Albert also looked up to him and idealized him as a hero. Albert describes the situation as follows

my brother, getting back to that thing about my brother (2) [clears throat] he was my hero (2) and to be ah (2) vilified ah I dunno what the word is ... to be actually set upon by your mother [who] says you'll never be this and you'll never be that and your brother is [a great person] and you're just a Scots bastard ...it was a bit odd to me... I never hated my brother for it as in you'd think that you could you know ... he's still my hero. It's like, it was like a confusion thing as in (2) in myself you know as in I took it back into there [points to his stomach area] in the end in the end aye, right ... right inside there, and I thought well (2) I just better hang on to all this shit ...(L231)

While Albert maintains that he 'never believed' the things his mother said about him, he admits that he always had a doubt; maybe she is right. He was and still is bitterly angry with his mother for these abuses. His mother openly attacked what Albert held sacred: his relationship with his father and his relationship with his oldest brother. By doing this she also destroyed what was good about his own relationship with her. But Albert's adult anger is greatly tempered by empathy for his mother's circumstances.

He understands that she had a 'hard life' and suffered herself. He oscillates between hostility, anger and blame on one hand, yet appears to feel ashamed and guilty for having these feelings. He makes the distinction that although his mother did what she did, and that is the prime source of his anger, he is ultimately responsible for his anger and his life. He has the attitude that to blame his mother for what is wrong with his life is contemptible. The following excerpt shows that with the benefit of hindsight, Albert can conceptualize of himself as his own source of anger:

I was my own worst enemy (2) and it doesn't matter about my mother now you know like putting that shit in there....in the end she put it in but the thing that probably made me angriest of all was the fact that I was the ... idiot that kept it there...(L326)

So, within the interview, Albert expressed anger at his mother for her ill treatment of him, and anger at himself for keeping that anger alive. He appears to oscillate between blaming his mother and blaming himself. He maintains the latter position through disavowal of his mother's role in his own troubled life. Yet he cannot get away from the knowledge that the patterns of his life were set within the family context, which was dominated by his mother, so he blames her. The anger Albert has for his mother is very much intact, and is expressed poignantly in the following closing words of the interview

She's a cunt [whispered](7) that's why I don't go and see her these days ... cos I couldn't give a fuck [quiet again] (2) she could fall off a ladder and break her fucking neck, I couldn't give a fuck [whispered] [P,s head is bowed and he is quietly sobbing] (L521)

Shame

Albert seemed to have a great deal of trouble conceptualizing shame, even though he chose to raise the subject from the outset. His speech was rapid and erratic as he tried to form ideas. His conversation centered around ideas that shame was not an emotion at all, rather it was a theoretical construct, which the interviewer was attempting to impose on his life – that he was bound to resist. He raised the possibility that shame was no more than a label or an arbitrarily imposed category. Albert was also making the general point that a connection between shame and anger in his case was inconceivable, and that his anger was not caused by shame.

So it is not clear how Albert defines shame but it appears that he associates it with the development of an adult sense of morality. For Albert, this moral cognizance occurs at around 15 years old, and involves deciding for one's self what is right and what is wrong. As well, shame is something we are aware of according to Albert. How can it be there if

we don't feel it? Shame is also associated with actions in Albert's view - you 'do something' you are ashamed of. If you are not wholly cognizant of the fact that it is wrong, that is, you haven't learned the wrongness of it yet, then you can't feel shame:

...does shame come in when you're 15 and realize that you do have (2) um an option and you start growing at 15 or 16 and you realize you're not 12 anymore and that you can just go and then learn and you go well that was wrong to do that but I didn't know before hand so I've learnt that, but when you're 15, 16 and you decide that that is wrong and that is right, and you continue ...does shame come into your life later on because you know and you think your way through it and you go, well up to that point, there can't be any shame (2) because if it is, it is someone else's shame put on you and you're reflecting it or whatever, whereas after that does shame come in at the age of 16 and you go well I can, I can be ashamed of myself or I can feel shame for this period of life here, () but I can't for that back there (L57)

He also postulates that a child cannot feel shame because they are still learning about what is right and what is wrong and therefore cannot be held morally responsible for their transgressions. Therefore children's shame does not come out of them; rather someone else imposes it on them. Shame imposed from the outside is a recurrent theme within the text although Albert did not formally define it. For example, there are numerous references to his mother belittling him. Albert sees this as someone else's shame, that is, his mother putting shame onto him. But whether the source of shame was from within or without it is still felt.

Several months later in a follow up call, Albert was asked if he experienced shame as a child. He answered unequivocally that he did. When asked to elaborate, he stated that he always felt inadequately in relation to other children as a child. For Albert, shame and inadequate are the same word and refer to the way he saw himself in relation to others. He said that as a child he did not feel that he fitted into the New Zealand context, which for example his cousins did. Their parents were Kiwis and Albert's father was from the United Kingdom.

He was also aware that other kids came from families with only one father. Also, as mentioned in L486-488 of the text, he wondered whether other kids were beaten as he was.

But the thing that had a profound influence on Albert, as a child was his mother's constant belittling and demeaning of him. All of this added up to a 'sense of inadequacy' in young Albert, a sense that he wasn't worthy or good enough. Rather than thinking maybe other kids had it better, he knew they did.

The only other context in which Albert talks about personal shame is from the present perspective. For example he concedes that he feels shame for some of the violent things he has done in his life, but that is only a recent thought, what he calls 'post mellow shame'. In the same vein he talks about being ashamed of the way he has treated certain women in his life, in the sense that he treated them with contempt when they genuinely wanted a relationship. Of this he says that it was

quite brutal I think to play with someone's internals or emotions like that....I feel quite ashamed about that ... um maybe more sensitive to that issue myself because I can remember what it's like to have them [played] with ... (L399)

Albert is a self-described misogynist and there is no evidence to suggest that he felt shame at the time. In fact with regard to the shame about his treatment of these women, Albert concedes that he doesn't 'know whether the shame is before or after or is it just now a big huge build up of shame' (L396)

Shame and Anger

In the first interview Albert fervently denies the possibility of experiencing shame in his childhood. He remembers anger as being significant. Several months later he conceded there was a pervasive feeling of shame during childhood. In the original interview, Albert conceptualized shame as occurring as the result of an act of which one is conscious of its wrongness. Therefore shame wasn't possible until adolescence. Later he added to this the idea of feeling ashamed of himself as a child in that he felt less than, or inadequate, compared to, other kids. His earliest recollection of anger is around 7-8 years old, and for shame it is more generally put as 'as a kid'.

Albert was subject to violent and emotional abuse from an early age. It escalated from the age of 7. One can be certain that Albert's sense of inadequacy and low self esteem are causally linked to the abuse he received both physically and emotionally. He was continually shamed by his mother and made to feel unworthy of the love and affection she gave to her favorite son. Albert was caught in the bind of having absolute fear for his 'primary attachment figure', from whom he needed closeness. With this position goes utter helplessness, confusion and despair. He describes himself as a 'very quiet' 'polite' boy who did all he could to stay out of his mother's way. To limit the damage and cope with his sense of despair, he retreated into himself, guided by the pre-programmed script of withdrawal. As he lived in a semi-rural setting, he had access to bush as well as the sea, and was often away from the house. When he was at home, he stayed in his room.

By the time Albert was around 10-12 years old, he was already experimenting with drugs and alcohol. He began to derive his identity from excessive intake, and drew positive attention from his peers for his efforts. He comes from a section of working class New Zealand culture, wherein social life revolved around the pub. The pub is a place where reputations for loyalty, honesty, excessive drinking and fighting were cultivated. Such was Albert's father's reputation, and one to which Albert aspired.

At 13-14 Albert was involved in excessive drug and alcohol intake. He established himself as a leader in this field among his contemporaries. He was attempting to allay deep feelings of shame and inferiority by using an avoidance script. By being the youngest and the most extreme at what were mostly anti-social pursuits, Albert earned the respect and awe of his fellows. Within this strategy, Albert was also incorporating his anger into his identity. He was actively using violence in rebelling against anyone, adult or peer, whom he saw as trying to dominate him.

Albert was angry, but he also recognized the efficacy of using violence to elevate his self-esteem. The more he got control of the violence the less chance there was of his sense of shame being exposed. Within Nathanson's theory, there is no logical progression or order with which shame-reducing strategies are used. All four strategies of the compass of shame (see Nathanson and Affect in the introduction) may be used in relation to different people in relation to one event. Here we see Albert operating within the *attack other* and *avoidance* scripts at the same time. It is important to note that scripts may characterize

instances of behavior, which are brief in duration, or they may describe patterns, which last over longer periods or a lifetime. The above is describing behavior attached to a particular stage of development.

Like many of his cohort, Albert steered away from education, an area in which the risks of humiliation are high. For example, to be seen to try and then fail is a strong deterrent for adolescents struggling with low self-esteem and already conditioned to accept their own failure. Albert attended a Catholic school, which, through excessive physical punishment and the liberal use of shame and humiliation, reinforced the negative messages he received at home. He reacted to this system with hostility and defiance, and was expelled at just 14 years old.

Albert grew up in a reasonably insular and tight-knit community. Within his social milieu, his attitudes and mastery of violence, even his intense anger, were seen as assets. Through a persona of anger, Albert learned to intimidate, thus humiliating would-be opponents without actual violence. As Albert got older he moved in the same environment as his father. Albert took after his father in reputation and there was mutual pride according to Albert. Besides being tough and hard and uncomplaining like his father, Albert's acceptance by his father was based on commonly held values such as honesty and a sense of justice.

Albert sees himself as a just and fair person, who works hard and isn't criminally inclined. Even his violence was directed at those he felt 'needed a hiding'. It was not random or purposeless. It is in this context that Albert sees his anger as a positive force in his life, one that pushed him to achieve the things he wanted. Through anger, Albert has been able to achieve an identity based around pride. This pattern is consistent with strategies oriented toward the avoidance pole of Nathanson's compass of shame, and helps explain the apparent absence of shame associated with his adult life.

Albert's relationships and treatment of women also fit into his pattern of shame avoidance. He describes himself as 'hating' women, and of being scared of them. He felt no guilt over using physical violence on them and took pleasure in using then disregarding them. He avoided any long-term relationships. He rejected them before there was any chance for development, or before they had a chance to reject him. He portrays himself as

sexually rampant and desirable. He reports a deep mistrust of female intentions and motivation and seems to see them as a threat.

At around 23 years old, feeling confident and self-assured, Albert went to work overseas. Even his new job in a harsh and remote landscape suited his disposition. It was a hard, tough environment and the work was dangerous. It fitted the avoidant pattern characteristic of Albert's modus operandi, wherein he constantly pitted himself against a formidable obstacle in an effort to prove himself worthy. Enduring the hardships and overcoming the challenges bolstered his pride and sense of self. The next few years were a period of self-belief for Albert and his anger had subsided. He was happy. Travelling overseas was also for Albert to do with the challenge of operating and gaining confidence outside his familiar environment. He was eager to develop himself socially, and his cause was advanced when he met his future wife in England.

Albert fell in love with and married a 'middle class' woman, from a gentle family. It would appear that Albert had wiped away the remnants of his childhood inadequacy. They had a child and returned to New Zealand. The *attack other script* had been redundant for many years and Albert felt close to who he wanted to be as a person. But problems soon developed within the marriage and old coping patterns re-emerged. Albert's sense of inadequacy resurfaced and he responded with anger and self-destruction. As his family disintegrated, he began to drink heavily and as a counterbalance to his emerging sense of shame and failure, he reverted to misogynistic, anti-social attitudes. He lost his family and found himself back where he started, except he was a bit worldlier and bitterer than before.

After drifting along in the same pattern for a time, Albert sought help. Through intensive counselling and therapy Albert ostensibly stopped drinking, and dealt with a lot of deeply seated issues relating to his childhood. Thereafter he removed himself from his hometown and went to live in the country. He has been struggling to stabilize his emotional world since. His moods are highly variable, and he describes himself up until a year ago, as 'seething with anger'. Sporadic employment and relationship conflict have been ongoing problems for Albert. He has struggled with motivation, and has tended towards depression at various times. Over the past 5-10 years, Albert has withdrawn not only physically, but also emotionally from his hometown environment. The content of his speech is laden with self-reflection and questions about himself. He has gone through

many processes and tried many strategies but is still burdened with a deep and abiding anger. He discloses that within the last year he has come to a turning point in his life.

As an adult Albert had visited his mother regularly and taken an active role in the upkeep of her living standard. He maintained her house, helped out where he could and ostensibly kept up the relationship. Their relationship was helped when 10 years ago, his mother spoke of her own circumstances when Albert was growing up. But this occurred in the context of a therapy she was undertaking herself, and focused on her own victim status. Within this context Albert had the chance to bring across his own grievances. He recalls with obvious anger, that when doing this, his mother simply turned away and changed the subject, which left Albert frustrated and feeling unacknowledged. She had rejected him once more.

He describes this reaction as typical of his mother and that he had given up on the idea that he and his mother might come to a conciliatory understanding of the past. He has now attempted to lay the shame based feelings of rejection to rest by disavowing his mother's importance for him. He now says that he simply doesn't care how, why or what happened in his past, and implied that any expectations towards his mother are gone. He has stopped visiting her, and has consciously rejected her as his mother. Again the source of shame is disavowed in the hope of avoiding emotional pain.

Albert's enduring anger is linked to shame within this context because in the face of a lack of shame and regret by his mother, Albert could only conclude that she was either oblivious to his suffering or that she thought it was normal. In fact he describes her attitude as – 'yours wasn't a special case, so what are you moaning about'. Albert attached great importance to the acknowledgement by his mother of his pain. Instead it was denied. This had the effect of perpetuating the feeling Albert had as a child (of not being loved) into adulthood. Not seeing shame in his mother raised again the probability that his mother never loved him. The logic here is that if she beat and put him down because as she said, she was 'messed up' and unhappy, then why now, when she is free of the stress and misery, is she unable to express her love for Albert. Albert has concluded that the love isn't there and never was. When Albert talks about his mother towards the end of the interview, it is with a bitter sadness. As he said at the beginning of the interview – 'it's someone else's shame'.

Case study #4: Ashley

Ashley is 50 years old, and is married with 4 grown up children. He left school at 15 without formal qualification and trained as a builder. He currently manages his own medium sized building company. He has a history of anger and alcoholism. He sought help and gave up drinking when he was 32. He also has a history of low-level violence and no history of criminality.

Ashley lives in a well-appointed house in a middle class suburb with his wife. On first meeting him he seemed relaxed and hospitable. He is solidly built and was slightly overweight at the time of the interview. He was attentive as the interview was explained. He seemed genuinely interested in the subject, asking questions to clarify what he was not clear on. He answered all questions directly and in detail. The majority of the interview involved his relationship to anger. Direct reference to shame occupied approximately 60 lines out of a total 735. He was frank in his answers and did not overtly avoid giving negative information about himself. In all, 89 questions were asked, yielding an average of 7 lines per answer. He had a relaxed speaking style and talked at medium pace. Emotionally there were no obvious signs of fluctuation during the interview. He came across as being detached from the feelings and events of his past. Ashley's mood during the interview was slightly melancholic, yet he smiled and laughed a lot while talking.

In an effort to explore the linkages between shame and anger, the two will be treated separately in the immediate section. An interweaving of the two, which will incorporate the participant's own views and theoretical considerations, will follow this.

Anger

Ashley grew up in suburban Christchurch in the 1950's. He is the third youngest of a family of 8 children, and the oldest of 2 boys. Ashley describes his mother as 'a typical wife of the 50's'. She was a supportive background figure who 'did what she was told'. His father was an authoritarian man who ruled the family with 'an iron fist'. His authority was absolute and unquestioned by the entire family. Ashley describes him as 'an angry

man' who strove to be the best at anything he did, with special reference to work and sport. He expected high standards of accomplishment from himself and his family. He was also a man who was 'handy with his fists' and in his younger years had 'a big reputation'. He was:

... never a ...monetary person ...it was just an achievement thing for achievements sake you know.... if you joined any organization you weren't just a member you became the bloody one of the executives or the president (L98)

Ashley's anger is associated with his father. As a child his father was a hero to him and he 'worshipped the ground' he walked on. But his father's acceptance of Ashley and his siblings was, to a large extent, based on their abilities and accomplishments. Some excelled and others didn't. Some thrived in the environment, and others failed to thrive. Ashley was in the latter category. Within his first 10-12 years, Ashley had arrived at the point where he felt it was impossible for him to reach 'acceptable' standards in any area. Whether it was sport or to do with school, Ashley got the message from his father; his performance was below standard - 'not quite good enough'. If he protested that it was the best he could do, his father would say 'you're not trying hard enough'. For example Ashley represented his province in schoolboy rugby. He was not praised for the achievement, rather:

it was always; 'ohh well there's another grade next year' [father speaking] (2) that sort of shit just kept goin on and on and on (L120)

Ashley began to show signs of disaffection towards his father at an early age. He stopped trying at school and soon began to slip behind

probably about 8 or 10 it was ... I thought well stuff it I'm not going to botherno matter what I do I'm never going to be quite good enough (2) and from that point I stopped ...trying (L83)

Ashley remembers that as a child he was angry. He had a bad temper and remembers having to be restrained by his mother on several occasions to prevent him 'attacking' his sisters. He muses that 'maybe it is the essential me', meaning he was angry by nature. When asked what he remembered about his feelings when his father continually diminished his achievements, Ashley states that he 'would have been furious'.

The emotion he associates with his father is absolute fear, and he surmises he would have concealed his anger. He would 'slink off', which left him with a feeling of frustration and helplessness. He began experimenting with alcohol at around 10, and was getting drunk whenever he could by the time he was 12 years old. At intermediate school he was always in trouble and typically his reports read '...heaps of ability but won't make an effort'. He remembers being humiliated and belittled by teachers at this time, which aggravated his frustration and animosity towards them and the authority they represented.

During his teenage years at high school Ashley coped with upsets by getting drunk. He lacked confidence and would avoid situations in which he could be humiliated. At the school dance he was the kid who could not bring himself to ask a girl to dance, and so would get drunk and obnoxious and hide in the corner. He relied on his peers for approval. He describes himself during his late teens as 'totally crazy', being out on the edge doing the most daring and often suicidal things in order to prove he 'had the guts' and to gain validation from peers.

Ashley says that he has always been a cynical person, and something of a loner. He is untrusting of people, saying he always had the feeling 'you don't put yourself out for anyone cos you'll get hurt'. He says he doesn't believe 99% of what people say to him; he believes only what he sees people do. This was a philosophy that applied to his wife and children as well as the general world. People had to prove their worthiness through actions to ensure affiliation with Ashley, and failure to do so resulted in his rejection of them. In relation to this, Ashley also kept at a distance, and controlled those around him with anger. He built himself a reputation as someone to be feared, an angry and if need be, violent man. He describes anger as an incredibly powerful organizing force in his relationships.

Ashley describes himself in relation to his wife as a very possessive man. He had an overwhelming need to control her because, he says, he always feared she would leave him. If he felt threatened by another man, he would simply react with violence:

I managed to live my life and control myself and the people around me with varying degrees of anger from (1) from mild raised voice to violence [laughs] (2) I could control (1) my wife, my kids and the people surrounding me (L14) ...I (5) I kept them at a distance (4) my wife and my kids ...we were at arms length (3) and yet ahmm (8) yeah strange (2) um my wife's described the way I kept her as sort of being a bird in a cage (1) and I would bring her out on occasions to show her off to people at different times, and then put her away again (3) so she never had any freedom (3) she only had freedom when I let her (L44)

Ashley's wife confided to him that she never left him in the first 10 years of marriage because she was afraid he would kill her. Ashley admits with some embarrassment that he probably would have at that stage. From the age of around 23 until his middle 30's Ashley's life was out of control. He was drinking heavily every night and worked long hours, trying to cram as much into as shorter time as possible. Ashley sees alcohol as a double-edged sword during this time. On one hand it caused chaos in his life and was very destructive. But from when Ashley was very young, he had always used alcohol to escape and relieve unbearable feelings

I'm quite lucky I knew what alcohol did for me cos if I didn't I would have probably killed myself or somebody else (2) because it just got too much to handle, you just felt like your head was going to fly off your shoulders ...mmm so you get pissed and that would just dampen it down for a while ...relieve the pressure and tension (L280)

It was tacitly assumed by Ashley and those around him, that it was the alcohol causing the anger. But five years or so after Ashley had given up drinking he realized that he still had 'this massive anger'. He tried to suppress the anger without alcohol but said it would just build and build. He likens the process to the 'straw that breaks the camels back'. He manages to control it for a month or 3 but it's always 'bubbling away' underneath. Then something small like a parking ticket or the wrong word said by someone, would send Ashley into a rage. He has over the last decade, done an Anger

Management course and a lot of work on self-development, and admits he has come a long way in controlling and understanding the mechanisms of his anger.

But anger is still prevalent in Ashley's life, and he recites a substantial list of situations which make him angry. These include dealings with the police, IRD, and bureaucracy. It is the fact that these institutions have power and authority over him that he says makes him so angry. In these situations his anger is an automatic response. This pattern of responding has been in place for as long as Ashley remembers and is linked in his opinion to relationship to his father and experiences at school.

Shame

Ashley's conceptualization of shame only becomes clear when relevant sections of his narrative on shame related subjects are gathered together. When asked to define shame in his own terms, Ashley conceded that it is difficult. He defined it as 'the opposite of pride'.

(4) I don't know, it's very very hard (7) yeah shame is being [inaudible] it's it's (2) it comes right back from something you're not proud of isn't it I suppose, as being the opposite of it. Anything that I'm not proud of I'm probably ashamed of (2) and then having a continual feeling of that would be shame wouldn't it (L158)

Elsewhere he associated shame with being aware that he was falling below standards that he had set for himself. Ashley discloses that 50% of the shame in his life came from other people, and 50% from things he has done. Feelings of 'uselessness' and of being 'not deserving', had been constant in Ashley's life up until quite recently. He links these feelings with failure to live up to his father's expectations as a child:

... oh yeah shit yeah! You don't just do things ordinary (3) so yeah and that's that (3) that feeling of of sort of (4) uselessness I suppose (2) of not deserving. It came back a lot later ahh later in life as not being deserving of (2) a lot of the time it was not being deserving of the bloody earth I was standing on or the air that I was breathing (L136)

As a child Ashley had low self-esteem and he remembers a pervading feeling of worthlessness and inadequacy, which would remain until adulthood. Of himself as a child, Ashley says he ‘never felt quite good enough’ in relation to other kids, that he had to try that bit harder and be that bit better in order to just feel equal. He describes himself as always feeling he had to prove something; he would have to throw stones further than other kids. He also used physical acumen to try and get his father’s approval, but without success. In the following Ashley describes some of his father’s typical reactions to his achievements:

if I came home from, with an exam paper from school with 9 out of 10 he’d say oh (2) why didn’t you get 10 (3) and if I came home with with [sic] anything good it would always be oh why didn’t you get better (3) and if I played a game of rugby and I scored a try and I’d say I scored a try today dad, he’d say well why didn’t you get 2 (L768)

Although Ashley used adjectives such as ‘inadequate’ and ‘worthless’ to describe himself as a child, there was resistance to the idea of shame per se being part of his experience. That is, there was a reluctance to equate worthlessness with shame. When questioned about his feelings over his father’s treatment of him, he euphemized that he ‘probably did feel a bit of shame’ or that he must have felt shame’:

probably (2) yeah (1) yeah probably initially I would have ... might have felt a bit of shame (2) yeah probably I did and in the finish I would have been uncomfortable with that so I would have thought oh bugga it I’m not going to put myself through all that bullshit again so I just didn’t bother anymore (L506)

Within Ashley’s memory, only his failure to meet a certain standard was recognized and acknowledged by his father. As if in protest, from around 10-12 years Ashley stopped trying, which he says gave him a less shaming reason for failure than lack of ability. Ashley admits that as a teenager, he really did not believe he had the intellectual ability required, and says he ‘probably’ felt ashamed of this sometimes. Paradoxically he doesn’t blame his father for his own negative self-image. Ashley remarks on several occasions that

he never felt it was his father's intention to shame him, rather it was that his father was trying to guide him in his own way, and was doing what he thought was best for Ashley:

well I think I got a a (2) feeling of worthlessness (2) from not being able to live up to (1) I think I put it on myself (1) I don't think anyone put it on me (2) but I think my old my fathers' (1) ahh helped trigger it (L71)

ohh I'm sure that if he could speak now he would be devastated if he knew the way how I took a lot of those things that he said to me ...like he wasn't being brutal and sadistic, like a lot of kids are totally brutalized ...that wasn't the case in my case at all ...it was he was trying to motivate me and he was trying to do it properly with the best intentions (2) not for his own self gratification (L275)

Ashley says of himself at around the time he left school that he didn't have low self-esteem, he had 'no self esteem'. The following passage is illustrative:

...there used to be little war comics there was always sergeant Dan who was the hero and he'd run out and hand grenade a machine gun post or something, and there was always bloody coward Sam in the corner reading a book or letting everyone down (2) and that was me (2) that's the way I thought of myself ... from what I heard and the way he acted sergeant Dan would be my old man (3) and I would be the bloody coward sitting in the corner ... so that in life out there, whenever I got a chance () I did some of the most crazy things to prove to myself and to other people that I could do them ... that I had enough guts to do things (2) suicidal bloody things ... but I had to do that to myself to prove that I had guts and it didn't matter how crazy these things were that I did and I achieved them ... I still didn't feel quite good enough I still didn't measure up (L633)

Ashley identifies several areas of shame related to his adult life. One area is broadly referred to as 'the whole thing with my wife' Another related area is his drinking in general and some of the things he had done when he was drunk. Both of these are periods of shame, which co-jointly signaled a major turning point in Ashley's life. With his drinking, Ashley experienced what he describes as 'soul shame', a feeling of shame so profound it is felt on all levels; spiritually, emotionally, physically and morally. It was felt at a specific

point was when Ashley was 32 and came in the form of a crisis or breakdown. He describes himself as ‘totally ashamed of what [he] was doing’. This is taken to mean – the way he was living his life, who and how he was as a person. This feeling of shame drove him to seek help for his alcoholism and he stopped drinking within a short period.

The shame associated with his wife was also something he only became cognizant of later in life during therapy for relationship issues, and after he had stopped drinking. He reports being totally oblivious to the way he was treating his wife, until it was pointed out to him in counseling. He began to feel shame when he realized the nature of his controlling behavior and how that had affected his wife and family. He describes it as a ‘total revelation’.

Another profound moment of shame occurred during an argument with one of his sons. Ashley was around 40 years old at the time and his son was 14. Ashley explains that

he’d really been pushing the bloody (2) line (2) and I blew up (2) and I picked him up by the collar and I had his feet off the ground and I was like that [pulls his fist back] went to hit eem and I looked straight in hes face and the fear! (2) that was in ees face and I thought wow (1) and it immediately changed and I was that wee kid (2) and and he was my father (3) and I was doing exactly the same thing to him as what my father did to me and I knew then, I knew exactly how much I hated the old man for doing that (5) ...that moment was incredibly shameful (5) and that was in a moment of anger – complete and uncontrolled anger ...I’d lost it at that point... it wasn’t til I actually saw ees eyes the fear in them, that I could relate to it just like that.... the minute I saw that fear - I recognized it (4) and (4) yeah (2) was just frozen by by by shame (1) at that and that shame just completely and totally froze that anger just [clicks fingers together] ...that anger and that heat from that anger was just completely dissipated and it was just total shame and bloody ...to think that I’d fallen into that trap that I’d said to myself ...all my life that I’ll never do to my kids what my old man did to me (3) anyway I caught myself right in the middle of it (1) I didn’t hit him but that was enough ...so there was a lot of shame involved in that (559)

It is interesting to note that the standard that Ashley violated is a very private one. It was not for example a standard concerning violence toward children or violence in general. Elsewhere in the text Ashley talks about his feelings of shame in relation to his violence in

more general terms. For example, he is not ashamed of being a violent kind of person. Similarly Ashley saw no reason for shame over his intimidation of people or his violence toward them. He always saw his anger as justifiable and felt that his violence, and the corresponding 'hard man' image elevated his self-esteem.

Shame and Anger

Ashley grew up in an environment that fostered in him high levels of shame. He could never measure up to his father's high expectations, and internalized an image of himself as 'not being good enough'. However, as a child he did try very hard to gain his father's approval. It seems though, that both his efforts and achievements went unacknowledged by his father. This left him with a feeling of rejection and a sense of inferiority.

In reference to Nathanson's compass of shame, it appears that in his childhood up until around 10 years old, Ashley was operating predominantly from an *attack self script*. He apparently tried from an early age to make his father proud of him through dedication to the standards imposed by his father. Desperate for his father's love and approval Ashley poured energy into everything including school work and especially sport. He excelled in rugby, yet his father withheld his approval. Even if his father were impressed about something, he would not say so according to Ashley. It seems that in the important ways this strategy failed Ashley. With every attempt came the pain of rejection and a compounding of his sense of inadequacy.

By around 10 years old Ashley recalls a shift in his resolve to meet his father's expectations. He began to think he was not capable of meeting his father's standards and so 'why bother'. The withdrawal of effort is, in Ashley's case, a way of avoiding the painful sense of shame that had previously rewarded his efforts. It is also a passive expression of disappointment and resentment towards his father, from whom Ashley felt he deserved more. Overall then Ashley's withdrawal of effort is motivated by anger, some of which he says 'would have been' directed at his father.

Even though his father's approval was an unattainable goal for Ashley, it is likely that Ashley took a large portion of responsibility for this failure upon himself. Ashley perceived that it was something about himself that was the problem, because to question his father's judgment would have been unthinkable. A multitude of factors point to this including, Ashley's age (he was young), his pervading sense of shame (and inherent low self esteem and inadequacy), and, the fact that siblings achieved highly and were accepted by Ashley's father. It must also be remembered that his father's authority was absolute and unquestioned, and that he remained a heroic figure to his son. Ashley's frustration and anger then was partly directed inward at himself.

There is a natural tension between the concepts of blaming his father and blaming himself. It represents a generic split. For example the former concept could be associated with Ashley's self concept in the following way; if it's my father's fault then I'm ok; if it's my fault then I'm not ok, I'm defective. These two notions about the self appear to have been competing in various forms for most of Ashley's life. A period of particular vulnerability seems to have been between 12 and 15 years old, when Ashley's behavior became more anti-social and self-destructive. His failure to cope with his negative feelings internally manifested itself in a pattern of tension reducing behavior which revolved around alcohol. Ashley slipped into the role as the troublemaker in school, making it loud and clear that he failed because he didn't care to try, rather than that he didn't have the ability. His behavior was designed to distract attention away from his self-shame, to portray himself as the things he wasn't, such as, proud, fearless, confident, emotionally 'bullet proof'. Generally speaking, these behaviors constitute a pattern, which is consistent with the avoidance pole of the compass of shame.

Between 15 and his early 20's, Ashley's pace of life was frenetic. He did everything to the extreme, carrying on the pattern of competition that had begun in his childhood. But even though Ashley competed with everyone around him, the source of his competitiveness lay with his father. His father had set the benchmark to which Ashley constantly compared himself. These comparisons were invariably negative. But Ashley wanted to become the person he imagined his father wanted him to be, and he harbored a latent ambition to prove himself to his father. However, his father died when Ashley was

just 18. He talks about his struggle against feelings of worthlessness and low self esteem in relation to his father dying in the following terms:

It was major and it was continuing (2) see the old man died when I was 18 and that sort of ...stuffed everything because I couldn't prove anything (2) I'd lost me chance to actually go out in the world myself and actually do what I wanted to do, be successful and say [makes an up yours with his middle finger] so he beat me again didn't he, and that took ...bloody 10 or 12 (2) 15 years probably after he died like for me to get over that lot (L93)

Ashley was faced with a situation he couldn't cope with internally, and so he immersed himself in work, sport and alcohol. He had a deep abiding sense of anger, yet he was not aware of either where it came from, or that it was seen by others, especially his wife and children. He drank heavily, which bought out pent up aggression and anger. He recalls that his anger and violence was always justified, and that he felt no shame over specific acts or his behavior in general. As far as Ashley was concerned, the other person was always to blame, or 'they deserved what they got'.

Not surprisingly Ashley worked his way into a position of authority in his job. His self-esteem was so fragile that just being in a subordinate position activated his sense of inferiority. He soon established his own building firm that he has run single handedly for many years. He had created a reputation as a hard, uncompromising person who led by example. He worked himself to the extreme and demanded absolute dedication and commitment from his employees. Even though he derived great pride from his work related efforts, he was still, as a person, plagued with a gnawing sense of worthlessness and inferiority.

Anger served not only to propel him forward, but it also kept those around him at a distance. As an adult Ashley depicts himself as being big and tough on the outside, but full of fear and self-doubt ('like a jelly baby') on the inside. He controlled his wife and children with anger and the 'constant threat of violence'. Because they were scared of him, they were compliant to his authority. This was the pattern by which Ashley conducted all of his social relationships. He kept himself emotionally distant from those around him and maintained a position of power. Within this context he was operating within the attack

other as well as avoidance programs of shame avoidance. In order for those around him to gain his approval, they had to reach the benchmark set by Ashley.

Since Ashley had stopped drinking he was forced to rely on deficient coping mechanisms. They failed, and as a result Ashley was unable to modulate his anger. He took his anger out on anyone and everyone. It was through the incident with his son (described in the shame section above) that Ashley began to realize that he in many ways had replicated his father's attitudes and style of operating. At the instant of seeing the fear he had provoked in his son, Ashley was stricken by shame. Not only did it de-escalate his anger at that instant, but according to Ashley, it raised a whole new way of looking at himself and the way he affected others. In connection with this, his moment of shame gave him a new perspective on similar acts from his past. This fits in with Nathanson's idea of affect acting as an amplifier for affect. It was in many ways a major turning point in his life.

With the intense feeling of shame came the realization of self-responsibility. It had the effect of opening up a well-sealed vessel of ideas and feelings relating to the wrongness of his father's treatment of him. Ashley was forced to confront the long silenced idea that his father had 'unintentionally' inspired his own deep sense of worthlessness and inadequacy.

But it is one thing to experience these things internally, and it is another to share them with the world. The instant of shame or the resulting cognitions just outlined had what could be described as an internal effect. By bringing attention to his anger, Ashley was able to seek help and make adjustments to his behavior. By Ashley's own description, it affected the extremes of his anger related behavior initially. He has 'mellowed' considerably since that time and is now able to better modulate his anger. He describes that within the last 5 years his marriage has improved greatly and describes himself as happily married now.

But an analysis of the way Ashley speaks about himself, indicates high levels of residual shame. There is a strong tendency for Ashley to diminish himself and to take responsibility for things that are clearly not his. For example, late in the interview he defends his father by saying that 'he was pushing me to achieve for my own good'. He goes on that it was his own rebellion and 'anti' reaction that caused him the pain and not

his father's rejection of him. There are many examples of this nature within the interview. It is apparent that his father's influence is still strong.

Two broad areas of shame have been identified. The first is shame that was put onto Ashley in large part by his father. His father withheld affection, approval and encouragement, and acceptance of the person Ashley was. You were loved if you achieved something great and Ashley fell below his father's standards of achievement. This left Ashley with a sense of shame about himself, which incorporated feelings of worthlessness, defectiveness, and low self-esteem, inferiority and a sense of hopelessness. It seems that Ashley internalized these concepts and they were incorporated as part of his emerging sense of self. This form of shame is associated with fear, self-disgust, and diffuse anger.

The second 'type' of shame came from his own actions. This shame could be divided into two areas. In the first such area, the shame is associated with outside judgment. It is low level in intensity and is handled in Ashley's case by 'shifting responsibility, minimizing, and repetition (it hurts the first couple of times, but you get used to it). This variation of shame is co-assembled with outward directed anger.

The second area involves judgment of the self by the self. This involves shame affect proper, with all of its reactive tendencies such as shutting down, wanting to disappear, loss of body tone etc. These experiences are intense and painful, therefore unforgettable. Part of this experience, is anger at the self and self-disgust.

Case Study # 5: Arthur

Arthur is 39 years old, divorced and at the time of the interview was living alone. He has 4 children who live with their mother. He left school at 15 and has no formal qualification, nor has he any vocational qualifications. He was unemployed at the time of the interview. He has a history of alcohol and drug abuse, has been treated for sexual addiction and has a history of violence. He has been prosecuted and sentenced for assault on a minor.

The immediate impression of Arthur was that he was tense. His demeanor was serious and the atmosphere devoid of lightness. Physically he was of medium height and overweight. His posture was noticeably slouched and his shoulders slumped forward, and for most of the interview he had his arms folded. His face was somber, yet resolute, and he never smiled. He was nervous and smoked cigarettes constantly throughout the interview. He had a very clear vocal style and conceptualized ideas in an unusually concise and authoritative manner. His answers were generally to the point and relatively brief. Shame was talked about directly for about 40 out of 390 lines of dialogue (excludes interviewer questions). The average length of answer was a low 6 lines per question.

Emotionally Arthur seemed to hold himself on a fairly even plane. Variations in mood were noticeably absent for the duration of the interview. The pervading mood was serious, slightly agitated and melancholic. Eye contact was split between direct, engaging, and staring away and down.

Anger

Arthur is the oldest out of 4 children, 2 of them step siblings. His parents separated when he was 8 years old. His father left, and Arthur remained in the custody of his mother. Arthur is reluctant to talk in detail about any aspect of childhood, and there are few references to his father or mother. He remembers his father as an angry, violent man, who

beat him a lot. He has almost no positive memories of his father. His mother is described as 'overtly religious'. She was also depressed and had addiction issues. She was also extremely violent towards Arthur. At the age 11, Arthur was hospitalized for a month through her violence. He adds that he has got no memory of love from either parent. Arthur sums up the situation between his parents as follows:

um (5) I think that my parents were in a marriage that they shouldn't have been in (4) right and I think that they were constantly at war with each other, and I was a victim of that war ...I think (2) both my parents were very young when they got married (1) Dad was 22 and she was 21 (1) I suppose (3) to me that seems young, (2) and I think that they were ill equipped to be parents (L197)

Arthur's anger seems to be directed at both of his parents. He reports being angry as a very young child. His home-life, he characterizes as 'dysfunctional' and is associated with alcohol abuse by his parents, and anger and violence.

At 8 years old his father left, and his mother began working. He was often unsupervised and began to get into trouble from 9 or 10 years old. He was into stealing and vandalism, referring to his favorite pastime as 'roaming and smashing' windows. By the time he was 10 he was selling porn at school, looking for fights and was a bully. He was also bullied:

As a kid I was very much out of control (2) very much out of control as a kid (2) a very violent boy (1) I was a bully, I was bullied (5) I made the teacher cry ...got into vandalism, petty theft (L403)

At around 12 years old his mother joined a religious cult, where Arthur stayed until he was 20 years old. The experience inside the cult was traumatic for Arthur. Their discipline was harsh, and Arthur reports a lot of violence towards him, especially when he was smaller. At 14 years old he was 'singled out' and labeled as evil by the cult hierarchy. For the rest of his time there, he was treated as if he was the cause of everything bad that happened within the cult. He came to believe it himself. He describes having to suppress

his anger in the cult environment, for fear of 'getting a hiding'. By the time he left, when he was 20, he had not learned to process anger or other emotions in a healthy way.

For the first 3 or 4 years after leaving the cult, Arthur said, he lived like a chameleon, not knowing who he was, but mixing with different groups of people. But he said that his experiences both in the cult and before made him into not just an angry person, but a vengeful person as well. He was manipulating and sadistic, a trait he says, was inherited from his father. Arthur describes an incident where he slashed a man's car tires because he humiliated Arthur in public. In this and many other incidents he regards his behavior as 'sick' and shameful.

Arthur's life as a husband and parent started in his mid 20's. His anger and rage would have a devastating effect on his young family. He was still living in the mindset that he was evil and therefore not responsible for his actions or his anger. His anger would periodically build in to an uncontrollable rage, at which time he was violent to his wife and children. After that time, he describes that his rage was 'always there', that he was out of control.

facilitators on some of these programs talk about where abouts are you on the anger scale (1) from 1 to 10 (2) I'd be up there on 10 most of the time (2) I I would have described my anger as being like my blood (1) it come from my veins and it kept me alive (3) but then again it nearly destroyed me (L286)

The situation reached its climax about 7 years ago, when Arthur assaulted his 3-year-old daughter so badly she had to be hospitalized. He was given a non-custodial sentence, and his children were put into a welfare home. Arthur did a Stop Violence course and achieved considerable personal development after his conviction and eventually regained custody of his children.

Although Arthur had made progress, he was emotionally unprepared for the sole parenting role he was in. He had severe mood swings, and he was unpredictable in his behavior. Arthur was recently diagnosed with bi-polar disorder and depression and sees this as a factor in his inability to cope with the situation. Arthur's anger and violence resurfaced and periodically 'got out of hand'. He began taking drugs to help him cope and manipulated himself and his children in order to cover up what he was doing

yeah I knew it was wrong but but I justified it I minimized it I shifted responsibility for it and then I put it out of my mind and forgot it () but I hushed it up at the same time ...and I manipulated my children so that they wouldn't tell (L173)

The children disclosed Arthur's violence to their mother, and he lost custody of them. He became depressed and attempted suicide. Arthur failed to cope with the situation, and he was admitted to a psychiatric institution, where he remained for around 5 months. He then sought treatment for addiction issues, which partly involved revisiting his relationship with his parents.

Arthur says that throughout his life he blamed his parents for everything and resented the life that they had given him. He goes so far as to say that his 'childhood experiences made him violent, unpredictable and dangerous'. One of the things that fed and maintained Arthur's anger was that his parents denied responsibility for their part in his life. They denied their violence and abuse towards him and any culpability for his anger. His father approached the situation by urging Arthur to forget about it and that it is 'water under the bridge'. The more fervent their denial, the more Arthur's resentment grew. Arthur believed that it was necessary that his parents take ownership of what they had done to him, in order for him to shake off his resentment and move forward less encumbered.

This was at least partially achieved, when his mother took 'ownership of some of the stuff she did'. Arthur says, it helped the 'healing process between [them]'. But his mother's admission was qualified from Arthur's perspective, in that mitigating factors, such as her own depression and addiction, were introduced. For Arthur this fell short of the personal responsibility required to allay his resentment. He now says that it doesn't matter so much to him now whether his parents accept responsibility or not. He has chosen instead to focus on getting his children back and moving forward in a 'healthy' way.

Shame

Arthur gives no direct definition of shame. He does however say, that shame has been a significant influence in his life. He divides the shame that he has experienced into

two areas: shame as a result of his actions, and shame that has been put onto him by his 'care providers'. The latter is associated with Arthur's childhood and up until his late teens. The former is associated with his adult life.

Arthur describes the environment he grew up in as 'very dysfunctional'. The description of the quality of his relationship to his parents is brief and extremely negative. Not only did they physically abuse him, but his father also ridiculed and humiliated him. Arthur stuttered as a young child, the remnants of which are clearly audible today. While Arthur makes no reference to the cause of his stuttering, he does make a connection between his stuttering and him having low self-esteem as a child. His father's attitude to his condition is alluded to in the following passage

I'd say that from a very young age I had a low self-esteem... I know that I stuttered (2) quite badly when I was a kid (3) my father used to mimic that you know (1) my father would give me hidings and then poke faces at me while I was crying like ss [inaudible] at me through my tears (4) so this sadistic streak that I inherited (5) (202)

While not stated explicitly, it seems reasonable to assume that Arthur did not measure up to his father's masculine expectations. One example of this is his father's disapproval of Arthur's choice of sport

well right well for instance I remember ah when I was a young fella playing soccer (2) right and my father (1) um (2) denigrated me for playing a girls game, you either played rugby or league right but it was a put down... I remember the put down (L191)

The next references to shame are associated with the period when Arthur lived in a religious cult with his mother. There, Arthur was not only physically abused but he was subjected to severe psychological and emotional abuse. Arthur's experience of the way the cult operated is summed up as

...public beatings, humiliation, isolation, starvation, sleep deprivation (2) no contact with ahh family outside of the cult ...just isolationist (L19)

Arthur says that his experience inside the cult had a 'big influence on his life'. He likens it to being brainwashed or indoctrinated. Total obedience and adherence to cult values was required and a variety of shame-based techniques were used to pull non-conformists into line. On entering the cult Arthur already had behavioral problems and self-esteem issues. These were exacerbated through the constant shaming Arthur was exposed to as part of the cult's punishment regime. He describes for example, that he was often isolated in a sort of solitary confinement situation, and that he became the scapegoat and cause of anything that went wrong inside the cult.

P: well you know um (1) one point in time when they were isolating me they (2) told me that I was evil ...that I was Satan's door to God's church... so what they were saying was that everything that was wrong with that place was my fault because I allowed the devil to come through ...I had my mother disown me as not her son but the devil's son (2) right so every time that something went wrong for me (2) like I had very serious ahh (1) self confidence issues (1) so every time something went wrong for me ahh (2) I wasn't able to accept life on life's terms, it was if it's going wrong it's God punishing me because I'm evil (L56)

Also:

They had a thing called men's meetings (2) the power base there is patriarchal (1) and ahh they'd sit the victim um there'd be a huge circle around him and um (2) it would be like a [inaudible] meeting (1) they'd work on breaking down your self confidence (2) and your self esteem (1) and um just continually saying bad things about you to you and this could go on for hours (4) so destructive absolutely destructive ...(322)

Arthur came out of the cult with a 'serious inferiority complex'. He reports feeling inferior wherever he was, and put it down to having been 'continually devalued' within the cult. Whenever something went wrong for him, he interpreted it as punishment, because he was evil. He talks of an emotional connection between present negative events and childhood shame, explaining that it is something like *deja vu*.

it's kind of like um (2) every time something went wrong for me it put me back into the head space that I was in when I was a kid inside the [cult] (L51)

It is noticeable that at no point in the conversation about his first 20 years does Arthur mention feeling shame, because of his own actions. What has been discussed so far is shame that has been put onto him, which as mentioned elsewhere has a more abstract quality than shame from one's actions. It becomes clear that in regard to his adult life, Arthur is also intimate with the feeling of shame from his own actions.

Regarding shame felt because of his actions, Arthur identifies a variety of levels. They vary in quality and intensity and refer for the most part to shame from actions in relation to his children, and, shame from actions as part of the way he operated in the outside world. Of the latter, Arthur says that he was an extremely vengeful person. His vengeful behavior seems to have taken place over a long period of time, perhaps most of his adult life. Arthur was acutely sensitive to criticism and tended to interpret it as an attempt by others to shame him.

Regarding the example outlined above, wherein he slashed a man's tires because he had disagreed with him, he said he felt he was criticizing him in public, and as a result he felt humiliated. He believed that he was trying to shame him, which made him angry and seek revenge. However, Arthur was found out, and his reaction was to leave the area immediately and disappear for a while. In this example he felt shame because he was found out, but he was not always found out:

you could be my best mate and do lots of things for me and then one day if I decide that you crossed me in some way then you are my enemy (2) and I would continue being your friend and look for every opportunity to get one back on you and would actually do it to you without you knowing it is coming from me, stand back and laugh at you (3) pretty sick stuff (L360)

He emphasizes that this was typical of his behavior. For this kind of behavior Arthur says he is ashamed, emphasizing that he now thinks it 'sick'. Whether Arthur was generally ashamed of his vengeful behavior at the time is not discussed, but it is

conceivable that it is the ‘sort of post mellow shame’ referred to by Albert (see Case Study #3). What is identifiable is the difference between the word ‘feel’ and ‘felt’. Arthur ‘feels’ ashamed of his vengeful behavior now, and this is contrasted with the following example of shame, about which he says he ‘felt’ or was ashamed at the time.

As mentioned, Arthur was convicted for assaulting his daughter. She was 3 years old at the time and as a result of the assault has a permanent scar. He knows, that one day she will ask him about it. It is the shame from this and other violence towards his children that Arthur is profoundly ashamed of. Arthur experienced this shame after his children had been taken from him for the second time, and he was confronted with an affidavit citing violence and abuse towards his children. Arthur became suicidal and was hospitalized. He was heavily sedated for the first week and says that

and all I could do was lie on my back and think and all I thought about was my ahh shame ...I didn’t eat for 2 and a half weeks and I didn’t talk to anybody for 2 months I just sat (4) just sat facing the wall in a corner ... I was filled with self loathing and self hatred (2) and shame, I’m talking about shame here, the the shame was crippling (3) um that period of ssss (stutters badly) 7 weeks that I didn’t talk to anybody, I was silenced by shame ... for um (2) shame toward my children (4) (L107)

The feeling of shame was so profound and unbearable Arthur made several ‘serious’ suicide attempts during this period. He had also become severely depressed and in the weeks after being discharged, Arthur reports, that it was ‘an effort’ to get out of bed or feed himself. The above is a very complete experience of shame and for all intents and purposes signaled a major turning point in Arthur’s life. His actions had been exposed to the world and in some ways, there was nothing left to hide. What is interesting here is that the ‘exposure’ of Arthur’s secret (his violence towards his children) came in the form of an affidavit. Shame didn’t require that a person confront him directly, rather it only required that he knew people knew.

Shame and Anger

Arthur grew up in an environment that fostered high levels of shame. He was denigrated, and physically abused by his father. His mother was violent and because of her own depression and addiction issues was unable to be an effective mother. Arthur's childhood experience (violence, neglect etc) translated into feelings of being unwanted, unloved, not respected, all of which fall under the umbrella of shame.

There is not a period in his childhood, that Arthur didn't feel shame or anger. It is highly likely that the abuses, that he is conscious of, were already happening from infancy. Because violence and destructiveness was in a way sanctioned within his immediate environment, Arthur adopted very early in life, methods for dealing with shame, that don't characteristically occur until later in life. For example, he was violent from an early age, as was he destructive and deviant. His pattern of behavior corresponds closely to Nathanson's *attack other* script, a program based around the idea of the diminution of others in order to bolster one's own self-esteem.

Arthur established his early identity along the lines of being the deviant – stealing and selling pornography at school. He was the bully – someone who was to be feared. He was also destructive – someone who destroys what someone else values in order to cause distress and shame in them. This pattern is associated with sadism and the desire if not need to see others suffer.

On another level, Arthur's behavior can be seen as part of an *avoidance script* in that they were public. The idea here is to earn regard from peers by being perceived as someone who is unafraid of the consequences or fearless. This strategy involves an audience and the building of a reputation within that audience, from which a sense of pride is derived.

The behavior outlined rose in frequency and intensity from early childhood until around the age of 12 years. From 12 years old onwards, Arthur lived in a cult with his mother, and his life changed dramatically. He was already an 'angry and violent boy' on entering the cult. Conformity to cult rules and values was central to group cohesion and Arthur was ill prepared for this environment. The methods used to bring him into line were shame based, and were in his own words, aimed at breaking his spirit through humiliation

and degradation. It seems that the only emotional options open to Arthur was either associated with joy (linked to conformity) or shame (linked to non-conformity).

Arthur was made to live with high levels of shame for the 8 years that he was a member of the cult. He describes feeling anger at the absolute injustice of the situation but feared to express it. As mentioned elsewhere, the environment is influential as to which strategies succeed in reducing of shame. As Arthur was in a restrictive environment, it is likely that the attack other and avoidance scripts were not available to him. It is more likely that he relied on strategies associated with a withdrawal script and to a lesser extent an attack self script. The latter incorporates deference, and generally functioning at a lowered level of esteem in relation to powerful others.

One of the many striking features about Arthur's time in the cult, is the length of time he was there. The strategies available to him required the suppression of powerful feeling over a long period of time. Because of the way affects gain magnification through interaction with themselves and other affects, what may have started out as manageable levels of shame and anger, end up as massively distorted. This constitutes a radical shifting of baseline emotional functioning, and in this context it is not surprising that Arthur was diagnosed with 'bipolar disorder', and admits to have had major identity issues.

When Arthur came out of the cult environment at 20 years old, he was unsure about who or what he was. He describes himself as a chameleon, taking on the identity of whichever group he was around. In other words he avoided the shame of being dislocated from society, by aligning himself with a group. When things didn't work out with one group, he attached himself to another group, in a sense using them as camouflage for an identity based around shame.

Arthur had an extremely negative self-image, and, within the social context, he tended to think that people were trying to put him down or humiliate him. He elaborates that these experiences would put him 'straight back into the mindset [he] had as a kid'. What has been triggered is a script, which in Arthur's case is shame associated. This script is partly made up of the reaction program, which reflects a method, typical for Arthur, for handling the type of shame he is experiencing in the present situation.

Arthur's reaction was one of anger, and the impulse for revenge is taken from the attack other script. His description of his style of revenge shows it to be indirect and non-

confrontational, to the point where his 'victims' wouldn't know who or why they were attacked. By doing this, he has left them feeling uncertain and insecure, thereby reducing their self-esteem. Of course he has also made himself feel good in that he can witness their reaction from a sheltered but immediate vantage point. In hindsight, Arthur sees this behavior as 'sick', and is somewhat ashamed that this is how he used to operate.

During his marriage, Arthur became increasingly unhappy. His anger turned to rage and he was violent and abusive, both towards his wife and children. He was prosecuted for injuring his 3-year-old daughter, lost his family. This period of his life, which ranged from around 25-30 years old, represents a re-orientation in the way Arthur viewed his relationship to his parents. Previously Arthur had framed the negative circumstances of his life as occurring, because he was evil. Now the focus shifted towards a view of himself as more of a victim, and his parents as more responsible for his development. He describes his bitterness and anger over 'the life they had given [him]', and blamed them for what was bad in his life. He blamed them for not loving and caring for him, and ultimately for his low self-esteem and shame.

This was a period of bitter anger for Arthur, the consequence of which resulted in his children being taken from him for a second time. He was overcome with shame which he links to his mistreatment of his children. Indeed it was through shame, that Arthur's attention was refocused from his parents' shortcomings to his own. Before, it was his parents who had failed him, now it was he who had failed his children.

In this, as in similar cases, a pre-programmed withdrawal script takes over. The magnitude of Arthur's shame was proportionate to the intensity of cognitions and action tendencies he experienced. In Arthur's case suicide may be seen as the ultimate withdrawal, wherein he attempted to remove himself from his sense of shame through his own death. He describes himself as being filled with 'self-hatred' and self directed anger, unable to face or talk with anyone for several weeks.

In this context we see Arthur in a state of shame, which he is unable to control. He is defenseless, unable to reinterpret reality in his favor in order to avoid the feeling of shame. Instead of manipulating himself and his children and covering up, Arthur began to seek and get quality help. He became involved in a therapeutic process that involved addressing underlying issues, particularly those with his parents.

There is no suggestion here that Arthur's anger was redirected from his parents to himself. The issues with his parents were ongoing. He discloses that his bitterness towards his parents was so consuming, that it kept him locked into a negative emotional state, thus preventing meaningful change. He had confronted his mother on several occasions, with the intention of resolving outstanding issues, but without success. In the last 2 years and as part of the therapeutic process he was involved in, Arthur had the opportunity to address these issues to both his parents.

His father discounted the past as 'water under the bridge', and, according to Arthur, was not interested in taking responsibility for his treatment of him. His mother took ownership of 'some of the stuff she did', which went part way to mending relations. As with other participants, parental accountability is a significant issue for those who were abused. Through his father's denial of responsibility, and indeed the fact that wrongdoing had taken place, Arthur's negative feelings towards him increased. Clearly Arthur had an expectation that his father would feel something about his abuse. By not acknowledging it, his father reinforced Arthur's sense of unimportance in his father's life, and thus perpetuated his sense of shame.

It is argued here that his parent's unwillingness (or inability) to show remorse and shame for their treatment of him is a major factor in the maintenance of negative affect in Arthur. Because there was little or no shame shown by his parents, Arthur was deprived of the opportunity for forgiveness. Broadly speaking, it is impossible to truly forgive someone who denies that forgiveness is necessary. Arthur was left feeling humiliated, and subsequently withdrew his efforts at reconciliation with his parents.

Arthur stated that until recently, his resentment towards his parents over their response interfered with his rehabilitation. He now adopts the approach that their acknowledgement is not necessary, and he has chosen instead to pursue the goal of getting his children back in his care. In this sense, the high levels of shame that Arthur has lived with, remain in-tact, although he has shifted the focus from his past to his children and the future. He has attempted to disavow the importance of resolving long-standing issues with his parents, thereby reducing shame through an avoidance script.

In summary, as a child his parents continually shamed Arthur. He was disappointed and angry. He displaced his anger onto others through an attack other strategy, thereby

elevating his self-esteem. His teenage years were spent in a particularly shaming environment, the oppressive nature of which forced him to go inwards, disguising negative feelings. Again his anger can be seen as a reaction to being shamed by others.

In his twenties he felt continually attacked and inferior to others. He reacted as he had been treated in the cult, by reducing the self-esteem of others, a strategy from the attack other script he had adopted as a child.

His anger and rage within his family environment caused him to commit acts that brought shame onto him. His anger reaction was directed to himself, which provided the impetus for change. Through confrontation with his parents he attempted symbolically, to reduce his shame by getting his parents to own it. This failed and Arthur's anger increased. He copes with shame and anger through an avoidance strategy, which requires the re-allocation of resources to a program likely to produce pride.

Case Study #6: Anton

Anton is 35 years old and is married with 3 children. He left school at 15 without formal qualification. He has recently gained accreditation as a carpenter and is currently in stable employment in that trade. He has a history of drug abuse (marijuana, opiates, various others), alcohol abuse and violence. He has a long criminal record and has spent much of his adult life in prison for various offences, many of them violent.

Physically, Anton is tall and powerfully built. Apart from several small tattoos on his arms, he has the healthy appearance of an out-doors person, which belies his violent past. His demeanor is rigid and unexpressive. He is obviously nervous about the interview. His verbal style is stilted and euphemistic. That is, many answers took only a few words and most were drastically understated. There were no long detailed answers as in other interviews, and questions were usually answered directly and quite frankly. Of 480 lines of Anton's dialogue about 70 dealt with shame directly. Overall, 131 questions were asked yielding an average of 3.6 lines per question). There was little self-ingratiation or embellishment to his answers. He talked at a relaxed pace and tended to be clear in his delivery.

Emotionally, Anton seemed quite detached, leaving the impression of being either over controlled in his emotional expression or, that he is reasonably emotionally unaffected by past events. However, when talking about traumatic childhood situations, Anton was consistently reticent. His dialogue, including talk about himself, had a very objective or descriptive quality about it. It can be likened to the reading out loud of an emotional passage in a book, without emotional expression. He smiled rarely and his facial expression seemed fixed no matter what the conversation was about.

Anger

Anton was born into a family of 7 children, 4 boys and 3 girls. All three of his brothers are now dead. His father left when Anton was 4 or 5 years old. When Anton was 6

his mother remarried and her new husband brought 3 stepsiblings into the family. Anton has no clear memories of his father before he left. Before his stepfather arrived family life was fairly tough for Anton. His brother was in a bike gang and there were always lots of bikers in the house. Anton doesn't remember either his mother or father as being violent toward him in this time. But when his mother remarried, and his stepfamily moved in, Anton remembers that things changed for the worse, and life became 'real violent and real nasty'.

Anton describes his stepfather as 'a real drinker' and a violent man. For reasons unknown to Anton, not only his stepfather, but also his stepbrothers victimized him. He was something of a scapegoat within the family and was often unreasonably blamed and punished. His stepfather's violence towards him was severe, ongoing and unpredictable

violence yeah ...he put me um (5) I had me head split open, me shoulder broken, me wrist broken [a forced laugh] sort of things like that ...(4) you know um (2) there's one other time that me and my sister stood there and watched me Mum cut her wrists and [stepfather said] it was our fault that she was doing that ... (L62)

In these early years Anton remembers himself as a withdrawn and lonely child. He was bullied at school as well as at home, and remembers experiencing a lot of fear at the time. He muses that he was bullied at school 'probably' because he was such a loner, or because it was happening at home. Therefore, he put out a kind of 'pick on me' persona. His main defense against bullying was to run away and hide. He said he can't really remember feeling angry during this time but on reflection he probably was. He had already begun to engage in anti-social activities such as fire lighting, vandalism and other destructive behavior.

At 10 years old Anton stopped being bullied and 'became the bully'. His stepfather directly inspired this change ironically through the use of violence:

In the end you know I come home one night with (2) I coped a hiding [had been beaten up on his way home from school] and (2) you know coped a smack in the mouth from him (step father) you know for not standing there and fighting my fights so (2) from that day forward I stood there and fought my fights ...

I: so you realized you had to stand up for yourself?

P: yeah to stand up for myself ...I was to stand up for my own rights I wasn't to take a hiding you know sort of thing.... that's what I think he tried to teach us but he just taught us that violence was acceptable (1) you know (2) at first when I started getting violent at first I was protecting myself (2) and then I was physically looking for it (2) you know anyone to pick on (82)

From the age of 8 or 9 Anton had also began to take drugs. His violence and anti-social behavior kept him in regular trouble with police, and at 15 he was convicted for a machete attack on his stepfather, and sent to Borstal. It was also around this time that Anton began associating with a bike gang. Because Anton had 'grown up' with bike gangs, he naturally gravitated toward that lifestyle. Anton says that he was attracted by the feeling of 'brotherhood' that goes with gang life. It gave him a sense of 'normality' and security, and was, in his words, 'the life I was supposed to be living'.

Anton describes himself as being up until 5 years ago, a 'nasty piece of work'. As a gang member, violence and drugs were a major part of his life. He was involved with needles and opiate use and describes this part of his life as a blur. He was also in and out of prison between the age of 20 and 30. As an inmate, anger and violence played an important role in self-protection

especially when you go into jail (2) if you are angry and just a mean person (2) you get left alone (2) you know (2) it's sort of yeah (2) you put out a persona; don't [mess] with me and if anyone does you take him out straight away (2) you know (2) and they leave you alone (196)

We have seen so far that Anton grew up and lived most of his life in a violent and angry environment. But Anton was not simply reacting to environmental stimulus. He had grievances towards his parents which center around them not being there for him and the family. Anton recalls feeling vengeful anger in relation to his father, which reflected a whole raft issues centering around abandonment and rejection. He describes his childhood

and youth as a 'living hell', and thinks that it would have been different and better if his father had stayed around.

Anton describes growing up with feelings of not being complete, and with a longing to be with his father. But there was no contact with his father after he left and Anton's longing slowly turned into anger and disgust. At 19 years old he 'hunted' his father down with the intention of violent retribution. He blamed his father for 'abandoning' the family, which of course laid the way for a great deal of personal suffering. He did find his father and they became very close. Anton shifted in with him and after living together for 6 months Anton's resentment unexpectedly surfaced and he physically assaulted him

I think it was just all the anger and hurt I had inside me for him leaving me alone (2) abandoning me (1) and that's what it was over I think ...but ...I had entertained the thought of beating him up, making him pay for what he'd done to the family sort of thing but (2) it wasn't intentional, I just jumped up one day and just took to him ... (L454)

His father accepted Anton's anger towards him. Because he did so, a period of conciliation took place. His father was already ill when Anton found him and he died 4 years later. But in this time Anton was able to resolve the issues he had with his father and says that at the time of his father's dying, he was 'at peace with him':

and knowing that he was going to die I suppose I had a chance (2) of [amm] releasing everything (1) you know how I felt when I was younger, how I was so angry at him for leaving us (2) how I was really pissed off ...about everything (L469)

Elsewhere in the interview Anton describes himself as being 'bitter at [his] life and 'bitter at [his] parents. When asked about his feelings toward his mother Anton concedes that he 'doesn't hold [her] in very high standing'. In regards to his mother, he focuses on her rejection of him saying that

I did see a real good Mum but (2) ahh the bad out weighs the good (7) you know even, I fought all my life to try and get my mother (2) you know to sort of (1) to get her

attention (2) I suppose um just to get her to say she loved me (2) just to hug me you know (6) you know (2) it never worked (2) even when she was dying you know she couldn't even do it (582)

Today, Anton says that he still has anger. In fact he describes himself as being afraid of his anger, and that he fears he will 'snap' one day and hurt someone. His emphasis recently has been on monitoring and controlling his anger in conflict situations, and his key strategy is walking away.

Shame

When Anton describes shame, he describes the feeling of shame from his personal experience. He describes being 'shut down' by shame, and associates it with one's inner most being — the soul. He also describes the impulse to disappear and avoid contact with others. From the intensity of feelings described it is clear that Anton is talking about shame, and not guilt, embarrassment or humiliation. In the following segment, as well as numerous other references in the text, Anton associates shame with intense psychic pain:

I don't know I suppose the only way you can really describe it is soul wrenching you know, you just ache from inside (2) physically it just pours out of you, just ahh yea starts from inside and comes through the whole lot of ya (2) like (2) it cripples ya (2) yeah, don't want no one to see you (4) ...[to] shut down and disappear

As a child Anton says he had very low self-esteem, a 'low standing' of himself. He also had and still has low self confidence, which manifests itself as an anxiety that he will let someone important down. He traces these feelings back to his childhood and the messages he received from his stepfather:

P: ah yeah I think it goes back to the messages my parents gave me...well my stepfather who raised me used to tell me I was hopeless and I couldn't do anything that I'm dumb and yeah

I: so how did that make you feel at the time...?

P: I knew I wasn't stupid, I knew I wasn't dumb you know but when you have it delivered to ya many many times you start to think that you are you know what I mean (L07)

Added to this is Anton's image of himself as a loner and a bullied child, whose only defense was to run and hide. As mentioned he was bullied at home as well as at school. Anton muses that there must have been a sign on his back saying 'pick on me' which acted as a 'magnet' for would-be bullies. He also describes differential treatment between himself and his stepsiblings, which reinforced his perceived lower status in the family. For example he was more often blamed for things and physically abused, and he received more verbal abuse from his stepfather. His stepfather also sexually abused him at a young age, which generated feelings that Anton says will be with him for the rest of his life. It is in connection to the family environment detailed above, that Anton began to take drugs - 'to stop the pain' of the beatings, and to forget the abuse.

There are few references to shame for the period roughly between 10 and 30 years old. As a young teen Anton transformed his sense of self through violence. He came to be regarded as someone to be feared rather than as fearful, and recalls with a certain pride that he 'didn't hide from no one anymore'. Anton describes himself in his early 20's as having a 'cold heart', which no one not even his wife could get to. He says that he 'felt sorry for no one' and felt 'no guilt' for what he did to people. He also describes this part of his life as exciting in many ways especially when compared to his current working life.

The shame that has been discussed so far, and especially that from the early part of Anton's childhood, can be seen as shame which has been put onto him by others. In contrast, when Anton talks about shame and his adult life, he refers to shame as a result of his own actions. There seems to be two main sources of shame in this respect.

First, there is the sort of shame, which Anton seems to encounter when his memory serves up a shameful act from his past. This may be seen in a similar context to Albert's 'post mellow' shame. That is, the shame was not felt at the time, but is rather the result of retrospection. These remembered acts are viewed from a newly acquired moral perspective, which, at least in Anton's case was gained years after the remembered act was

committed. Anton's current morality can be seen in the context that he has converted to Christianity, and now tries to live by a Christian ethic.

The second source of shame in Anton's adult life was felt more or less at the time of the act, and signaled a major turning point in his life. In his late 20's, Anton was convicted and sent to prison for the sexual molestation of his daughter. There is no reference to shame for these acts before he was caught. The description of shame seems to begin at the time of revealing his actions to his wife. He owned up and admitted his guilt because a formal accusation had been made to the police and he was arrested. Anton describes the process as follows:

I talked the cops into letting me go [into my room] to grab a few things ...so I went and grabbed a whole heap of pills, that was the last I had so I took them ...the next couple of days I wasn't really worried ...and then when I come down to earth I knew then I had to tell [wife] what was happening (2) what I'd done ...I cried probably for 2 days before I told her (2) and then after I told her [by phone] I ...it would have been a good 2 months 3 months I cried every single day (2) cos of what I'd done to my family (5) ... (L520)

Within the context of shame Anton identifies several areas which all served to compound his sense of shame. There was the shame from having to tell his wife and from knowing that he had destroyed her and that there was nothing he 'could do to repair it'. There was the shame that he had 'lost the family income' and put them back on a benefit, the shame over what he had done to his daughter, and the shame that he was incarcerated with sex offenders.

When Anton was jailed he recalls that he didn't or couldn't come out of his room for the first month. He describes being 'crippled' by shame, not being able to talk to anyone and wanting to disappear. When he did finally emerge, he was confronted by fellow sex offenders, people who, because he himself had been the victim of sexual abuse, he had a strong loathing for. He recalls beating sexual offenders 'unmercifully' while previously in prison, and to be convicted of the same crime was something he 'could not get over'.

Ironically, it was among sex offenders that Anton was given the help he needed. While in prison, Anton was exposed to intensive therapy in which he managed to 'clear up

a lot of rubbish' from his past. On release from prison, Anton's impulse was to disappear and live in another part of the country. On his wife's urging, he decided to stay and attempt family reconciliation. Progress has been made in this area. Even so, Anton says that he carries the shame for what he did to his daughter every day, and that it is especially potent when he is confronted by family anger directed at him. Even though he feels that he is sentenced to live with these feelings for the rest of his life, he seems accepting of the situation. An important part of sex offender rehabilitation is victim empathy. It appears that Anton is reviewing his past with more empathetic eyes. This new reinterpretation brings forth a steady stream of shameful acts, which Anton attempts to deal with emotionally:

there's not a day that goes past that (2) I don't think of something that I've done (2) to other people (2) you know (2) I've hurt a lot of people in my life (2) and I can't make it better (L217)

Shame and Anger

Anton was brought up in a family environment that fostered high levels of shame. He is conscious of feelings of low self worth and inferiority as a child, but is not conscious of being angry or aggressive. As a teenager, he recalls being chronically and violently angry. As an adult he experienced shame from his own actions.

In the shame section above, it was shown that as a child Anton came to view himself in terms associated with shame. The reasons cited include: abuse from his stepfather, not being nurtured by his mother, and the absence of his father. He therefore felt unloved and abandoned by his parents. His stepfather physically, emotionally and sexually abused him over a prolonged period. He describes his childhood as a 'living hell'. Because of the ongoing trauma, and negativity towards him, Anton had to cope with high levels of densely packed negative emotions such as fear, despair and shame.

How did he deal with feelings of shame? He states that one part of him never accepted what his stepfather said about him, but after years of exposure to put-downs etc, he came to accept his stepfather's view of him. His principal defense against shame was withdrawal. He was quiet, sullen, a loner whose isolation seemed to attract a great deal of

bullying and victimization from both inside and outside the family. In this context, withdrawal served to perpetuate shaming behavior by others. He was so quiet and withdrawn, that he was labeled 'stupid' and 'dumb' by his stepfather and stepsiblings. In the face of overwhelming brutality and fear, defending himself was out of the question, and he saw himself as having no choice but to simply live with the situation, essentially taking it all on board.

Because Anton was so withdrawn, he had trouble making friends at school, and up until 10-12 years old, he had none. He recalls that his mother was no comfort to him, as she herself had major issues (depression, being seriously abused by her husband) that she herself could not deal with. The only support Anton recalls is from his brother who was many years his senior, and a member of the gang that Anton would later belong to. This support consisted of threats and violence towards his stepfather, which was ineffective at stopping the abuse. His brother also sexually abused Anton, yet despite this, he held him up as a hero and later as a role model.

In the face of such severe and sustained abuse, Anton's sense of self formed around the concept of himself as worthless and unimportant. The concept that he was undeserving of anything good incorporated the inverse idea that he somehow deserved to suffer as he did. Therefore he never developed the idea that he ought to defend himself. He was consequently passive, as shame upon shame was heaped onto him. This is characteristic of an *attack self script*.

In order to cope with the resulting psychic as well as physical pain, Anton began taking drugs from an early age. This is seen as part of an *avoidance script*. Early drug abuse can only be seen as a desperate attempt to escape from feelings that were uncontrollable by any other means. Withdrawal failed to curb shaming attention from others, and it appears that drugs served multiple purposes including numbing the resulting pain, as well as acting as an aid to withdrawal. In this sense drugs were an extremely important part of Anton's survival-script as a child. His supply was obviously plentiful and included tranquilizers and painkillers from his mother.

So far, it has been suggested that Anton coped with shame through withdrawal and avoidance strategies. At 10 years old Anton began to use his fists. But he doesn't portray the change as self-inspired (as in I've had enough of this, it's time to fight back), but rather

as an instruction from his stepfather. One could say that he started fighting in order to avoid punishment at home – he was doing what he was told. Furthermore, he does not associate his early violence with anger. Initially he fought to defend himself, and he notes that through this process he became more aggressive.

Within 18 months, Anton went from being the bullied to being the bully. He began to operate exclusively from an *attack other* script. Now he ‘wasn’t hidin [sic] from nobody’. The feeling he got as the result of violence is the same as that stated by every other high anger participant; it felt good because it raised his self-esteem. When comparing his feelings about himself, both before and after he began fighting, Anton describes it as ‘the exact opposite’. Instead of fearing people, people began to fear him – instead of being shamed by people, he shamed people. The feeling was so good that Anton went out looking for fights.

Anton was angry long before he was violent. As his violence increased, so did his confidence. As his confidence increased, so did his anger. Anger that Anton had hidden or avoided as a child found increased expression as fear levels decreased. With his anger came a distorted sense of vengeance. Anton was now in a position not only to defend himself against abuse, but also to seek revenge against those who abused him. His anger bore a direct lineal relationship to the intensity of shame felt as a child – the more shame the more anger. The source of anger here lies in the fact that others had shamed Anton for unjustifiable reasons. To retaliate against those who did, or would shame him, was in Anton’s mind justified and therefore not a source of shame. This is why he apparently feels no shame over the machete attack on his stepfather or his subsequent incarceration. He was 16 years old at the time.

As well as the abuses outlined already, his father also sexually abused Anton. Through sexual abuse, shame was added to shame, all of which Anton sought to undo or remove through the destruction of his stepfather. What is at play here seems to be the idea that the shaming of the ‘abuser’ by the abused is essential for the reduction of the abused person’s shame. Justice must be done so that the abused can move on. The ineffectiveness of this as a shame reducing strategy is reflected in Anton’s statement that he ‘still’ struggles to live with the effects of being sexually abused.

Part of the massive anger that drove Anton from his teens well into his 20's was directed at his father. Anton believed that his life would not have been the 'living hell' that it was if his father had stayed. Therefore everything that happened was indirectly blamed on his father. Underlying this are abandonment and rejection issues, which lie at the core of his self-concept. These 'issues' are represented as negative beliefs such as 'he doesn't care about me' which leads to 'I'm not worth caring about'. Despite his father's absence, Anton retained core attachment needs, and describes the overwhelming 'longing' to connect with his father. Over time these needs went unmet and the result was a steady build up of anger and resentment. Feeling rejected and betrayed by him, Anton sought to settle the debt he felt he had with his father through violence.

There is little doubt that Anton expected to find in his father a man who was uncaring and irresponsible. But instead he found his father to be caring and willing to take responsibility for his part in Anton's pain and anger. Even after assaulting him, Anton was surprised to find his father was willing to nurture a close bond between them. Anton describes the ensuing relationship in language akin to healing and forgiveness. He describes being able to relate to his father the negative feelings he had as a consequence of his childhood. The key point here is that his father understood Anton's anger and bitterness and was contrite for his part in it. That is, he expressed a sense of shame over the effect his abandonment of the family had on Anton.

As with both Anthony and, to a lesser extent, Angus, the opportunity for conciliation occurred in part because of the imminent death of the parent. This aside, it is the quality and degree of responsibility and subsequent remorse by the parent that regulated the degree of atonement. Anton describes the 4 years that he knew his father as 'very special', years he wouldn't trade for anything, and this sentiment is reflected in a brief, but high level of emotionality in this section of the interview.

This event had the effect of alleviating a major source of anger for Anton, thus facilitating repair to self-structures previously affected by abandonment and rejection issues. However, manifest changes were for various reasons non-emergent. One reason is that Anton's life away from his father was characterized by criminal as well as gang politics. Analysis of this aspect of his life is informed by an idea raised by Anton himself:

if I wasn't so angry (2) what would I have been [thinks to himself] (2) you know would I have been ashamed as someone that had a lot of shame but I was so violent and so out there (2) to hide it (2) with drugs you know ... what was I hidin from ... (L553)

Anton spent much of his adult life in prison. Whether he was in or out of prison he was a gang member. Gang membership in respect of the present analysis, is viewed as part of an *avoidance script*. Gang membership is earned, and is a source of security, belonging, and prestige for members. Individual identity is blurred into group identity, and it is the strength of this identity that affords its members a strong sense of pride. Therefore by being a member of a powerful group, Anton shares in the prestige, the pride, and therefore reduces his own sense of shame.

A discussion of the relationship between gang life and shame is beyond the scope of this paper. Suffice it to say that incorporated into the ideological parameters of gangs are the twin concepts of alienation and strength. Alienation connotes rejection, isolation and shame. Shame is associated with weakness, and strength requires the suppression of weakness and vulnerability. From this perspective the core function of a gang is to convert shame into strength. This is also the goal of individual members such as Anton. Therefore a gang is strong only because the group goal is identical to its individual member's goal.

According to Anton, within the world of gangs and prison, anger is an asset. In both areas one's physical well-being depends on the persona one projects. The 'meaner you are the greater your chances of being left alone'. Therefore anger has a protective function in this kind of environment, and as such, must be maintained. This aspect of Anton's life derives from the *attack other script*, a strategy that by Anton's standards has been extremely effective. Between the *avoidance* and *attack other scripts*, Anton has radically altered his self-concept and achieved an identity he is proud of.

Anton took pride in his family. However, family life for Anton occurred within the context of gangs and prison, and the accompanying strategies of avoidance including heavy drug use, anger and violence. His life experience had, according to Anton, led him to this way of being, and his way of being relied on the suppression of empathy. As Anton said 'I felt sorry for *no one*'. Lack of victim empathy is intricately bound to child sexual abuse, and to shame (Lewis, 1992).

The following discussion involves Anton's sexual abuse of his daughter. It will be kept brief and confine itself to issues pertinent to the relationship between shame and anger. It is assumed here that at the time of sexually abusing his daughter, Anton knew it was a shameful act, but through drugs, alcohol and lack of empathy, he didn't feel it as such. The shame that he felt in prison was severe and painful. Nathanson proposes that the intensity of shame is directly proportional to difference between one's perception of one's actual self and one's idealized self. This seems to apply in Anton's case. From respected gang member and father/provider, to child molester, being in prison with other sex offenders was a painful reality check for Anton.

The shame was intense and so was the resulting anger. Part of this anger was directed at the other inmates. He was deeply ashamed to be part of a group he had previously denounced as 'the lowest of the low'. They were the audience and he was ashamed in front of them. In a sense, it was his animosity and anger towards them that kept him separate from them. It said, 'I am not one of you even though I'm here'.

Mainly, his anger was directed at himself. The damage caused to him through sexual abuse as a child, he had perpetuated onto his daughter. He brought shame onto himself as well as his family. He destroyed his wife and children's trust in him. He had done irrevocable damage to the ones he loved. Through shame Anton was made vulnerable, and therefore was able to examine the core of his vulnerability. He revisited the shame of his upbringing, part of which derived from being a victim of abuse himself.

Through the exposure of previously well-hidden aspects of his past, Anton had nothing more to hide. The more he owned his shame, the less angry he became. Through disclosure of his shame to his family, the process of healing was able to move forward, to the point that recently he has been accepted back. Anton describes that since coming out of jail, several people have attacked him with the intent of causing shame – one person spat in his face. He still gets angry but doesn't react with violence. His anger at himself helps provide the energy to make things right again with his family. It keeps him oriented to the fact that he is in a vulnerable position that relies on his dedication to change.

In summary, Anton was continually abused (physically and sexually) and shamed as a child. Feelings such as anger were directed inward and suppressed. His self-concept developed around shame, fearfulness that generated the mechanisms of withdrawal and

attack self as shame modulating scripts. At 10 years he began to ‘turn the tables’ using an *attack other script*. Between this and various avoidance strategies Anton achieved an identity based around anger, violence and fearlessness.

Around the end of his 20’s, Anton was jailed for the sexual abuse of his daughter. He experienced intense personal shame. Anger was directed at himself and together with shame formed the impetus for personal change. Because his shame is public and unavoidable, he has adopted a low profile, immersing himself in work and other pursuits that are associated with pride – a strategy derived from the avoidance and withdrawal poles of the compass of shame.

Case Study # 7: Angus

Angus is 30 years old and of medium height and build. He left school at 18 having gained university entrance. He studied at University for a year before dropping out. He has no vocational qualifications and at present is employed part-time as a casual labourer. He is in a steady relationship and has no children. Angus has a history of drug (including opiates and marijuana) and alcohol addiction. He has a mildly violent past and has a history of criminality.

On arriving for the interview (mid afternoon) Angus was still in his dressing gown. He came across as friendly and relaxed. His demeanor was non intimidating and non aggressive. There were very few questions before the interview. In recent years he has undergone extensive self-development. He gave the impression of someone who has thought a great deal about his own developmental processes. In other words he has done a lot of work on himself. He therefore had fairly complex theories about the whys and wherefores of his development, and was happy to share and build on these during the interview.

Angus stated from the outset that he did not support the notion of going back into one's past in order to effect life changes in the present. This position manifested itself during the interview as a resistance to talk about his experiences and how they affected him as a child.

Most of his answers took the form of monologues, which as they unfolded formed a fairly comprehensive picture of his past, and especially of those who influenced him, namely mother and father. For 680 lines of participant dialogue only 50 questions were asked (average= 13.6 lines/question). His style tended to block the asking of questions. In this interview, more than others, there was a tendency for Angus to interrupt and /or disregard the researcher's questions in order to carry on with his explication of personal thoughts. Of shame there were approximately 100 lines relating directly to the subject of shame. While he was willing to talk about shame quite extensively, he tended away from direct association to himself.

Emotionally he was stable throughout the interview, showing no extremes of anger, sadness, shame or any other emotion. Angus related that at the moment he is in a good phase of his life and is feeling positive about himself. This in combination with thoughtfulness and vocal activeness gave the impression of a positive mood.

Anger

Angus is the youngest of 5 children – 2 brothers and 2 sisters. He was a late arrival and his father was 45 and mother 37 when he was born. His father was an accountant and Angus describes his upbringing as middle class. His mother was extremely religious, and while Angus was growing up she turned more and more to the church as her marriage deteriorated. Angus describes her as ‘...full on Anglican evangelistic ... preachy (2) absolutely obsessive’. He also describes her as kind, and a person who did a lot of good in the community. He remembers his father as having a ‘domineering nature’ and having old-fashioned ‘Victorian’ values. He had a naval background, serving for 5 years during WW2. Angus portrays him as a ‘bit of a pub brawler ...a real mean bastard’.

Angus associates his anger with both of his parents, each for different reasons. He remembers his father as an alcoholic, who was angry when drunk or sober. He was never happy. He was never violent towards Angus but was threatening and verbally abusive. In relation to his father Angus was to be ‘seen and not heard’. A lot of his childhood he remembers, was spent ‘laying low’, keeping out of his father’s way. He likens the predominant mood of the house as tense – ‘like walking on eggshells’, trying not to upset Dad. As a child, Angus says he was probably angry with his father but doesn’t remember anger as the predominant feeling of that time. What he remembers is fear of his father, which is connected with intimidation and the threat of violence rather than actual violence.

when I was young and he was around I didn’t really feel anger towards him (2)umm I guess I did at times but I don’t remember it being a prevailing feeling ...I was scared of him, and it’s almost like (2) I knew that I couldn’t express any anger to him (2) cos he wouldn’t listen to it and um ...and even if he did I was too scared to because you wouldn’t have right at the time ...I would have got hit for it (2) I would have (L509)

During his childhood, Angus sought and received comfort and ‘nurturing’ from his mother. He felt safe with his mother and describes himself as a child, as a ‘mum’s boy’. He shared his mother’s religious beliefs, and as he got older and his parent’s relationship deteriorated, he took pride in the comfort he could provide for his mother. When Angus was 12-13, his role as mother’s support was taken over by his older brother. He describes feeling caste aside by his mother and recalls the feeling of rejection. He began to feel resentful and angry towards her, and began to drift away from the Christian ethos, which had previously bound him so closely to her.

As Angus grew into puberty and he began to embrace contemporary teenage culture, a clash of values emerged between him and his father. Angus recounts that his father was ‘anti everything’. He puts it down partly to the wide generational difference between them. His father’s intolerance of youth culture is illustrated in the following:

when I was ...[12 or 13] that Michael Jackson album came out ...so I bought it ... and I was listening to that on the headphones, and he came in and discovered it and he broke it ...because it was ‘mind rot’ (2) that’s what he would say you know (L283)

When Angus was 16 years old his parents separated and his father went to live in another part of the country. Up until then his father had exercised absolute control over the family, mostly through fear. Now that he was gone Angus began to ‘cut loose’. His will was his own as his mother was unable to exercise authority over him. He began to ‘dabble’ in drugs and alcohol as well as violence at school. He describes his pent up anger as being a ‘time bomb’ that began to explode slowly after his father left. For Angus as a 16-17 year old, it was about showing strength and earning respect, all of which he describes as giving him a ‘feel good’ at the time.

Angus discloses that although he feared his father, and his father had treated him unfairly and ‘without respect’, he remained a strong role model.

I mean as much as it scared me um it taught me too (2) it taught me how to operate ... he was there he was always there and so in that sense he was a father that was always there (1) and he might have been pretty scary and I might have wanted to avoid him at every turn but ahh um but but um fathers teach their kids how to grow up and behave

like a man in the world and so ...I got an enormous amount of my lead from him (2) and stuff that I unthinkingly I guess thought was natural (1) a natural way for a bloke to be you know (L171)

Angus decided he (his father) was 'a real tough guy', and he himself took on the tough guy identity. He became rude and belligerent towards his mother, and unmotivated at school, often not getting there till the afternoon. He was verbally abusive towards his mother and did nothing to help out around the house. His mother's reaction was to condemn Angus as being in need of religious redemption. Up until 14-15 years old Angus had followed his mother's religious faith and said that he was a 'Christian because she was'. Now like his father, he rejected it outright. Angus left school and home at 18 years, and it was at this time he began to 'really cut loose'.

He went to university, where he had hoped to follow in his brother's footsteps as a music graduate. He fell in with 'a bad crowd', began using heavy drugs and drifted into 'the criminal scene'. He also learned to fight on the street, hardening up and developing 'street skills'. He was still modeling his behavior on his father and describes 'wading into a fight' as if he was 'the old man'. As well as 'drugging', Angus was drinking heavily and getting into burglary and other petty theft. Scrapes with the law had become more common, and at 21 years Angus was convicted and sent to jail for assault.

As Angus's behavior had deteriorated over the years, his mother's conviction that he was on the wrong road and needed to be saved had intensified. In her view Angus needed to give himself up to God in order to be saved. Angus says that his mother's attitude toward him made him just as angry as his father's treatment of him. From his mother's 'constant preaching' Angus says he never felt validated as a person, and that the difficulties he was going through were largely unacknowledged by his mother.

I was trying to find my own feet in the world and um and I really felt like Mum was no help (2) at all in fact she was she was worse than that she was constantly telling me in not quite so many words the things she said she really did give me the impression that I was destined to failure and a bad unhappy life (1) unless I got Christianity... she made that message loud and clear (L178)

Angus surmises that neither his mother nor father taught him how to process his feelings, including anger. He describes his father as a 'suppressor' of anger, who would just bottle it up, until the anger came out, often in drunkenness. Angus says that all of 'that stuff' from his childhood is still there and that he is still angry, but after several years of self development, including alcohol rehabilitation and anger management programs, he has learned to 'process' and cope with his feelings. 'They don't have the power over [him] now that they used to'.

Angus traces his process of change back to around the time his father died. It was a slow and difficult process and for the next 4 or 5 years, relapses to old and destructive patterns punctuated his development. He describes his present relationship of 2 years as healthy and loving. He is positive about himself and his future, yet is still conscious of his 'closeted demons' from the past.

Shame

Angus found it difficult to define shame. He defined shame in terms of what it meant to him as opposed to a formal or objective definition. As with other interviews, fragments of a definition are scattered throughout the transcript. He associated shame directly with 'self-hate' and 'not being comfortable in [his] own skin'. Elsewhere Angus asserts that his shame has kept him 'locked down', like being in prison. He also links it directly to his own feeling of being unworthy. He states he felt unworthy of the respect of his father (in childhood) and his mother (adolescence).

Generally he alludes to the feeling of being unworthy in the more abstract sense of simply being 'an unworthy person'. He also described shame as having an immobilizing effect, of shutting him down. In a more indirect way he associates shame with not measuring up and not being good enough. As well as the interpersonal and intrapersonal levels Angus also links shame with society:

but shame yeah it comes down to feeling uncomfortable in my own skin (1) and when that gets on top of me (2) um I find myself immobilized and so (1) the world we live in

is is [sic] also one that um (2) that (5) ohh procreates that message (2) doesn't it um and there's a lot of voices out there that yeah know that um that that you've got to measure up you've got to be good enough and the way our system works means that slaps in the face are a lot more regular than encouragement ...(L20)

As a child Angus was very close to his mother and avoided his father. He remembers feeling loved by both parents, although his father tended not to express it much. But on an emotional level, Angus has for much of his life believed that he was 'worthless' and 'a blight on humanity'. He traces this feeling back to messages he received throughout his childhood and adolescence.

As already mentioned Angus remembers being fearful of his father and of being the child who is seen and not heard. He also says that he never felt respected by his father. He remembers his father as belittling and as putting him down a lot in a sometimes cruel and sadistic way. Angus likens his father's belittling language to 'verbal violence'. He is emphatic that he 'remembers the put downs' but says that he can't recall specific incidents off hand. Later in the interview, when talking about his father, Angus came up with the following example:

... sometimes he was angry and a bit cruel you know so I remember when I was a kid you know doing my piano practice ...we had a middle pedal that was a soft peddle ...you could switch it on and leave it on so that the whole thing was quieter (2) and even that was too loud for him (2) I mean he used to come in and say well you're never going to be Rachmaninof so why don't you give up ...(L42)...he was he was just belittling and just the general way he was, he was so angry he was (2) yeah the message definitely came across that you were a pain in the ass (2) to have around you know (L130)

All of the above added up for Angus to the feeling that he was unworthy. He also describes the helplessness of fear. His father was big and powerful and there was no way to confront him directly. His father's control over him was total, and Angus reflects that he was forced to hide himself, not only physically but emotionally as well. As mentioned, the

thought of expressing protest or discontent to his father was out of the question. This was not a temporary situation; rather, it was long-term and ongoing.

After his father left, Angus found himself free of his father's authority. He describes being very 'self-serving' and wrapped up in himself at this time. He began to do things that brought him shame, such as stealing from his mother. His mother voiced her concerns for Angus's 'wayward' behavior in terms of redemption and the need for Angus to 'turn to God'. This approach says Angus reinforced his view of himself as a worthless and undeserving person.

After leaving school, Angus became, in his words, a 'little waster' and 'a bad little bastard'. As his anti-social behavior increased, so did his mother's conviction that Angus needed to be saved. As mentioned in (L180), he heard her message 'loud and clear' that he would always be a failure unless he adopted Christianity. Because his behavior and lifestyle was so anti-Christian at that time, he said he always felt like a failure before his mother.

Angus concedes to being ashamed of some of the deeds he committed in his early 20's. He talks about 'ripping people off' and 'beating people up' during this time, and reports feeling shame over these acts. The criminal scene, and to a lesser extent, alcoholism, are areas that are synonymous with dishonesty. Lying to, and stealing from people within one's circle was commonplace. Angus reports that he is ashamed of this aspect of his behavior. He also admits to shame over the deception of a live-in girlfriend. For 2 years he 'drank and drugged' in secret in response to an ultimatum from his girlfriend that the relationship would last only while he abstained. Along the same lines, he describes feeling ashamed of being an addict and sees the label as 'just another rod' to beat himself up with.

Angus says that he didn't necessarily believe the 'negative messages' he received in his childhood, and he likens the situation to the difference between 'knowing something in your head and knowing it in your heart'. He says he 'sort of knew' that he was a good person, but the messages about his worthlessness were so strong that he felt he was conditioned into acceptance of them – therefore he *did* feel worthless and unimportant. He also says that the 'bad' things he did later in life also served to reinforce this view.

He describes the latter part of his life as a struggle to ‘feel’ that he was worthy of respect. He reflects that shame played a central role in his development and that when all is said and done his struggle has been against feelings of worthlessness and inadequacy. The centrality of shame in his life is highlighted in the following:

all those messages that I’d been given, all those negative messages that I’d been given and that I’d bought upon myself, [it] kept me locked in a prison where they had heaps of power over me you now... I don’t know because it’s just about whether you believe them or not (2) in a way except that it’s not that simple cos it takes quite some maneuvering ...some self manipulation, self growth, whatever you want to call it [in order to] not believe them (2) especially when you’ve believed them for a long time (1) know what I mean ... they are part of who you are (L403)

There was always the question of Angus’s contact with his father from the time his father left. In a follow up telephone conversation, Angus revealed that he had seen his father 4 times since his father left. He describes their relationship as ‘not close’. Angus discounted the possibility of talking to his father about his feelings as a child as ‘out of the question’, saying ‘he just wouldn’t have gone for that’. He last saw his father when he was 20 or 21. When his father died 2 years later, Angus was given a ‘book’ that his father had written shortly before his death.

In it he made a direct apology to Angus for the way he had treated him as a child. In general terms he took responsibility for all the harm he had done to the family. He also explained in detail why he was the way he was. He talked about his frustration and anger about his own life. Angus recalls this event as a revelation, which had a ‘profound and excellent influence’ on him. He describes it as ‘a hell of an apology’, and ‘moving’ because it was honest. He says it helped him connect with his father and made a big difference to his life. He describes the influence it had on his process of change as ‘a trickle down effect’, one that has over time helped him regain his self-belief.

Anger and Shame

Angus is conscious of shame related feelings such as worthlessness and inadequacy, during his early childhood years. He believes that anger was ‘probably’ there as well but he is conscious of it emerging around 12-14 years old. He surmises that there is a strong relationship between shame and anger, to the effect that shame keeps one ‘locked down’, which is frustrating and results in anger.

Angus describes his father as an alcoholic who was always angry and aggressive. He was a ‘hard man’ and Angus describes himself as a ‘mum’s boy’. Beginning in childhood, Angus was belittled, intimidated and dismissed by his father. In effect he rejected him. As a result Angus grew up feeling and thinking that he was a nuisance, and a ‘blight’ to his father – that he was unwanted by him. These self-referencing ideas therefore formed part of Angus’s internal representation of himself and his relationship to the world. His emerging sense of self was coloured in large part by shame-based schema to the effect that he thought ‘I am defective, I am unimportant’. His relationship to his mother appears to represent the opposite of this.

Angus recalls a very close and nurturing relationship with his mother. There is no doubt that she offered a great deal of support for him, and that they were both somehow united as targets for his father’s anger and discontent. The impression is that Angus spent his childhood sheltered under his mother’s wing, and that she in turn sought shelter under the umbrella of religion. In this context, Angus’s parents were at odds with each other, with his father openly slandering and denouncing religion.

What has been described so far is that there was a fundamental structural split within Angus’s family, with Angus and his mother on one side and his father on the other. Using Nathanson’s language, Angus was on the receiving end of his father’s *attack other* script, and he seems to have coped with this situation through the script of *withdrawal* as well as *attack self*. Angus has described the need to avoid his father ‘at every turn’ and of having to ‘walk on eggshells’ in order to avoid his father’s often negative attention. Through experience, Angus associated his father’s attention with being shamed, and, by keeping his distance, he was reducing the likelihood of this happening.

Withdrawal implies psychological as well as physical hiding. To withdraw is to disappear into oneself, to go quiet and deal with shame related feelings internally. Without a clear understanding of his own actions, Angus like any child, reacted to shame by ‘holding it all in’ as one does when keeping a secret. Withdrawal signifies distance, and therefore a weakened bridge between father and son.

What function did Christianity serve for Angus? Broadly speaking, Christianity provided a structure within which Angus could escape and find solace. It also served as a mechanism by which he could achieve affiliation to his mother. Angus states that he was a Christian because his mother was one, and not because of his own beliefs. He simply tagged along. It also provided a means through which Angus could adopt an identity, which was good (i.e., I am good because I believe in God). Furthermore, Angus may have been comforted by the idea that God loved him and that in God’s eyes he was special. All of this may have served to modulate feelings of low self worth associated with his father.

Angus had a lot of fear in relation to his father, and negative affect towards him was either repressed or suppressed. But the lid began to lift on his anger around 12-13 years of age when his older brother reappeared into their lives. Angus’s role as support for his mother vanished and he no longer ‘felt important’ to her. He uses the term ‘feeling caste aside’ as a synonym for being rejected. It appears that with the role of ‘support to his mother’, Angus was somewhat guarded against shame-based feelings. This is part of an *avoidance script* wherein a role is taken on which fosters a sense of pride.

His brother’s return signaled a turning point for Angus. His anger, which was the likely result of an accumulation of issues with his father, and more recently his mother, was expressed as rejection of his mother. He also turned away from religion, which amplified the emotional drift away from his mother. In a nutshell, Angus denounced what his mother valued, and this can be seen as both *avoidance script* and *attack other script*. He was saying ‘your (mother’s) belief is a lie, it is false and I am not part of it (avoidance). He was also saying ‘you are a fool to believe in something false – I know better’ (attack other).

In his early teens, the relationship between Angus and his father is characterized as emotionally distant. Angus was still fearful of him, and held to old patterns of avoidance and compliance where necessary. Angus’s move into teen culture clashed with his father’s

‘Victorian’ values. His mildly rebellious behavior also alienated him further from his mother’s religious values. Angus was at this point more conscious of his rejection of his parent’s values. By the time his parents separated when Angus was 16, he was beginning to act out his antipathy in an open and anti-social way. With his father gone there was no need for fear, and there was what Angus describes as an explosion of anger and resentment.

He describes an urgent need to satisfy himself after his father left, to ‘pump’ himself up and make himself ‘big’. He was defiant towards his mother, and began to fight at school. He sought to transform a shame-based self-concept, into a self, worthy of pride through an *attack other script*. He got into fights just to prove to himself (and others) that he was good enough. He became something of a bully in this sense.

After leaving school and home, Angus’s behavior became more and more anti-social. In an attempt to raise his self-esteem Angus developed violence related skills. He describes modeling his behavior on his father, and was still in awe of the physical prowess and ability to instill fear that his father had. As he himself had been made to feel small as a result of being on the receiving end of his father’s *attack other script*, Angus tried turning the tables using the same script.

He also tried to alleviate a deep sense of inadequacy through alcohol and drugs. It appears that this strategy that is part of an *avoidance script* was predominant in Angus’s adult life. Angus associates heavy drug and alcohol use with anger towards his mother. He reports that much of his frustration was about ‘not being validated’ or acknowledged by his mother. That is, rather than being loved unconditionally, his mother’s love was conditional of Angus accepting God. Her attitude that he was damned unless he accepted God was shaming and rejecting for Angus. He responded with anger and self-destructive behavior, designed to numb the pain of shame (avoidance), and to denigrate his mother (*attack other*).

The discussion so far has centered on shame, which from Angus’s perspective, was put onto him. That is, it resulted from the shaming of him by others. But Angus also admits to feeling ashamed of the person he was, because of things he had done. For example he discloses ‘ripping people off’, and beating people for no reason. He says he also felt

ashamed that he was a drug addict and an alcoholic. He was ashamed and frustrated that he could not/did not achieve a way of being which fostered self-pride.

By his early 20's Angus had come to despise himself and what he had become. Alcohol and drug abuse are seen as part of an *avoidance script*, designed to modulate shame related feelings such as self-loathing. In Angus's case their abuse had fed into his sense of personal shame. He had hit 'rock bottom', realizing that current forms of avoidance had failed. He embarked on a series of rehabilitation and self-development programs. Some of these were also shaming in that they labeled him an 'alcoholic' or drug addict'. His reaction against such labels is one of manifest anger.

Angus's move towards rehabilitation coincided with his father's death and Angus's receiving his father's posthumous explanation and apology for his ill treatment of him. The effect of this is reported to have occurred slowly over time. Why then did such a document fail to have the impact one might expect from such an act of contrition? One possibility is that Angus did not deem himself worthy of such an apology, and it is therefore likely that the experience fostered more shame in him. Whatever the case, the ensuing years of self development appear to be coloured with an overt reorientation from anger at his parents to anger with himself.

After several years of self-development, he says he still feels a strong sense of inadequacy and worthlessness. He is still angry. On the surface he directs his anger at institutions that he says keep people weighted down with shame. This approach is part of an *attack other script*, and seeks to apportion blame for one's demise to an outside source. In this he is admitting his shame but shifting responsibility for it.

Yet interspersed with this are statements about anger and frustration at himself, he admits to being angry for not being able to achieve his goal of personal pride and self-esteem. There is the impression that he still sees himself as helpless and somehow pathetic. He discloses that he is his own hanging judge and that his own sense of shame is what keeps him 'locked down'. From this point of view, anger is the result of frustration with his own shame induced inertia and consequent inability to achieve a desired sense of self.

Case study#8: Noel

Noel is 45 years old, of medium height and heavy build. He is divorced and has 1 teenage son, who is in his custody. He is currently in a long-term relationship. He left school at 16 without tertiary qualification. He did an apprenticeship as a panel beater and is at present self-employed in that trade. He has no history of drug and alcohol abuse or of criminality.

Noel was initially very skeptical about giving an interview and only consented to it after several long phone conversations. He came across as a down to earth, no nonsense person. He had a friendly manner and seemed quite relaxed. He seemed to relish the opportunity to talk about his past and was especially open to discussing anger. A striking characteristic of the interview is that Noel shared several stories about incidents, which he had not disclosed to anyone before. They were very personal in nature and indicated a high level of trust. He tended to answer questions by painting a fairly full, contextual picture, and so, many of his answers took the form of monologues or stories. The average length of his answers was approximately 10 lines per answer. On shame, Noel spoke approx. 130 lines.

Throughout the interview Noel was upbeat and jovial. Noel's mood was comparatively light, and the interview is punctuated with many bouts of raucous laughter. In fact his whole delivery had a 'black humor' overtone to it, which was even present when talking about sensitive and traumatic issues. He stayed within what could be considered a 'normal' emotional range; he didn't become angry when talking about anger, nor withdrawn or embarrassed when talking about shame.

Anger

Noel is the only boy out of 5 children. His background is described as working class. His parents are both over 70 years old and still married. His mother is described as being of hot tempered Scots descent and dominant within the family. Noel's father is characterized as a hard working man with alcoholic tendencies, who 'never raised his

voice', nor 'talked badly' about anyone – as utterly submissive and passive. Noel also remembers his mother as violent and recalls his mother regularly beating and abusing his father. She was also extremely violent towards Noel and, to a lesser extent, his sisters. Noel remembers the family mood as tense and often hostile.

His father was a 'regular man', who Noel remembers was up at 5.30 in the morning, made the kids' school lunches, the breakfasts and polished their school shoes 'everyday without fail'. Noel remembers he worked hard and routinely visited the workingman's club, after which he would ride home drunk. He recalls his mother being 'worked into a frenzy' by his sisters over their father's drunkenness. She would become angry – a situation that would often end in violence towards Noel's father. He says his father never fought back.

Noel discloses that he has been angry for a considerable amount of his life, starting from his childhood up until the last 5 years. He is conscious of his own anger from around 8 years old. He relates the origin of his ongoing anger to a particular event in his childhood. His mother was in pain with gallstones, and Noel was sent on an urgent 'mission' to fetch some medicine. On the way back from the chemist he ran into some friends and became ensconced in play. His father found him many hours later 'covered in mud'.

He returned home in time to see his mother being taken away in an ambulance, close to dying. Also gathered were his favorite uncle and aunty and sisters. Noel received the full blame for his mother's medical emergency. In uncharacteristic fashion and in front of everyone, his father beat and shamed him. He was also 'sent to Coventry' for a month, and for the rest of his years at home was never allowed to forget his transgression and its near fatal consequences.

He describes the process of blame and punishment as unrelenting. Neither his father or mother ever mentioned the incident again, and Noel was never acknowledged as 'not having done it on purpose'. For Noel it changed something about the relationship to his family for all time. He felt at the time, as well as now, that he did not deserve such harsh and cruel punishment. His remorse quickly turned to anger, both at himself for his act of stupidity, and principally, at the injustice of being judged without any attempt to understand his side of the story.

you hate them because they [family] ah (1) they don't really understand that you [never] meant to do any wrong you know (2) and they don't want to understand (2) you know (2) do they.... they've made their mind up you're the villain (2) and you hate them for it, you hate them for, it's really got nothing to do with them and they don't really understand what happened, they make you feel that bad ...and they ride it to don't they, well they did in my case ... I really [with a laugh] don't think I deserved that ...and I don't think I deserved to feel how I felt either (2) cos no one spoke to me...oh no one spoke and I couldn't speak to anyone else (2) I couldn't speak to my sisters they wouldn't have nothing to do with me, cos I nearly killed Mum, you know...(L250)

The ensuing years at home are characterized by Noel as being emotionally distant. He describes himself as a child as a 'pretty lost soul'. His sense of despair led him to make a 'pact' with his best friend to 'end it' (commit suicide) if things got too bad. He describes his mother as being violent towards him, often without fair reason. He recalls on one occasion being 'beaten all over [his] body with a stick' for not eating his school lunch, when in fact he had. Even though he explained it was his sister's lunch, his explanation was dismissed. Out of contempt over the injustice, he did not defend himself.

Noel recalls a steadily deteriorating relationship to his family, which culminated in his running away from home at 14 years old. He was found and returned home several months later. During his teens Noel recalls having 'a real problem with anger'. His avoidance of the family had increased from a young age, and by the time he reached high school, Noel was spending as much time away from home as possible and recounts walking 1½ hours to school and 1½ hours home to this end. He characterizes himself at this time as something of a loner. He was also involved in sports, namely rugby and rugby league, and channeled a lot of energy into these. He was also involved with vandalism and other anti social-behavior, and scrapes with the law were not uncommon.

At 16 years old Noel was 'asked to leave' school, and he took up an apprenticeship. He remembers his boss as standing behind him over some problems with the police and ostensibly becoming his mentor over the next 3 or 4 years. Noel gained many social skills during this time. But he also had a passion for motorcycles and gravitated toward the fringes of the motorcycle gang scene. He was at ease in the gang environment and

embraced its values, which included the use of violence to solve conflict. On the subject of being around angry people Noel says:

...when you're around angry people (2) it's so easy to become angry. (2) It's like bloody...sharks feedin...it becomes sort of like a frenzy ...[compares the difference between being at a party with mellow stoned people and one with a lot of angry people]...if they're borderline angry...there'll [inevitably] be a punch up and raised voices ...I could be stirred up in a position like that ... (L155)

As an adult, Noel describes himself as 'tense to be around'. He outlines many instances of violence, where he 'put a guy through a window' and 'broke another guy's neck' (accidentally) in a fight. He characterizes himself as 'not someone who needs to dominate others', but rather as someone who reserves the right to defend his self respect with whatever means are necessary. That is, he isn't someone who went out looking for trouble, but will stand his ground if it finds him. He makes his views clear in the following:

and with the cops...they've just got no right to be in your life [if you're not doing something deviant], and I feel that about most people ... I mean people don't go round pushing their face into other peoples lives willy nilly ...and yet police seem to (L402)

I don't rape, rob or beat up people, so I've really got no need to think [worry] about anything else have I...I work...never been on a benefit...it's a simple... sort of life [and I don't like people sticking their noses into it uninvited]... I've got no assault charges (L416)

I put a guy through a window once, because ... he was trying to put me down...have a bit of fun at my expense...I wasn't going to let him do that... up till then (2) I'd tried...[to diffuse the situation]...[but] when I get angry I um (2) I loose my words...you know and some people say you can always talk your way out of it, but sometimes if you're really (2) you know I can't and that was just one of these things... ...I wasn't there to interfere with his night; he had no right to interfere with mine... people pushing themselves [onto you] ...taking up your space with their negative crap...it's not something I tolerate really (L165)

Today, even though Noel can reel off a substantial list of people and institutions that make him angry, he says he has calmed down a lot. However a residual and underlying anger towards his family is still evident. He is considered as the 'black sheep', saying his periodic 'dark moods' are received with quizzical indifference by his family. The locus of Noel's anger and frustration towards his family was made clear recently. When attending the funeral of his childhood 'best friend' (who committed suicide), his father turned to him and asked why he did it. Noel exploded into a rage and stormed off.

A big part of Noels anger towards his father is associated with his father's submissiveness. Noel recounts that not only did his mother beat his father, but also from around 10-12 years of age, Noel was promoted by his mother, as the 'man of the house'. He was encouraged to beat his father (which he didn't) and at one point do him grievous bodily harm. Noel recalls not being able to come to terms with the situation and ran away when he was 14. He laments that

I would have given anything if he [father] had have jumped up and taken control of the situation pissed or not like yeh know (2) ah yeah and he should've (2) he really should have (4) he really should have but he didn't (2) it pissed me off (2) that pissed me off ...I was angry that he never got up off the ground sometimes and ... give her one (2), because I certainly wouldn't have stood for that

Shame

Like others interviewed, Noel struggled with a formal definition of shame. His definition has two discernable aspects. The first is the direct experience of shame as the result of a transgression. He associates it with a wish to be invisible and as being the opposite of self-confidence. The second is related and involves being exposed to shame for long periods of time. He describes shame in this context as causing 'you to slowly withdraw ...until you rot ...' and as being the 'lowest of the low ...the bottom of the pit'. He also refers to 'family shame' wherein a family is ashamed of the situation or

circumstances they live in. Here he is talking about families he has been aware of, who live with incest and other destructive abuses.

Noel's first and most poignant memory of shame is that described above involving his mother's gallstones. It involved shame on 2 interrelated levels; shame as a result of his actions and, shame put onto him by others. The first occurred when facing his family having already realized the gravity of the situation. When asked if he felt shame, Noel replied:

I just didn't want to look at anyone, I couldn't I couldn't ... and it wasn't some thing that I done on purpose...it was a kids thing, I was only 8 years old or something ... it just wasn't worth ityeah it was a good hiding too....oh yeah I didn't feel too good about myself ...I'd nearly killed me mother ...(L41)

During the following months Noel remembers feeling so 'bad' about what he'd done, that he couldn't tell his mates from his rugby team, why he couldn't come to rugby. The deceit went on for several months and involved Noel lying to his 'mates' every Saturday, making excuses such as 'I've lost my boots', and 'I feel sick'. He says, that 'even though I didn't do it on purpose, I felt bad and didn't want to tell anyone'.

The shame, outlined above, must be seen in the context of shame, that was put onto Noel by his family. The most significant aspect for Noel was his father's reaction. There is the sense that the 'hiding' Noel got was in a way seen as just punishment, in view of the serious consequences of Noel's actions. But Noel remembers that what made the greatest and long lasting impact was his father saying:

and then he [father] said to me he sez ... your uncle [name] he had you on a pillar that high [held him up, proud] (2) he sez, but now you're below the worms (4) and I mean like (2) it was terrible like...if I had of done it on purpose (2) well I don't know how you'd deliberately done something like that, but it was just one of those things you know (L49)

Noel was reduced to 'below the worms' in not only his fathers, but also his favorite uncle's esteem. Of his relationship with aunt and uncle, Noel says it was never the same,

and there was no opportunity to redeem himself in their eyes, because ‘it was never mentioned again’. Through these events Noel had essentially lost a supportive and valuable relationship in his life. Additionally, both during and for a long time after, Noel recalls his sisters as being punishing in a shaming way. He says, he was never allowed to forget what he’d done, nor that he was the kind of person who could do such a thing. In fact, nearly 40 years on, his oldest sister still brings it up, with blaming overtones.

Noel states emphatically, that it was ‘real shame’ that he felt at the time. He also states that it passed relatively quickly, because, as can be seen above, he was always convinced of his innocence and felt the punishment unjustified.

Another, more long lasting kind of shame, which Noel encountered in childhood, also concerns his father. On numerous occasions Noel witnessed his father being beaten and shamed by his mother. Although not stated explicitly, it is likely that to see his father being demeaned, was extremely shaming for Noel. As well, he was ashamed of his father for not defending himself or taking control of the situation. When his mother told Noel that he was the man of the house, according to Noel, he felt as if he had lost his father. From then on according to Noel, he ceased to respect his father. He recounts his feelings in the following passage.

...from that day on (2) it was almost like (2) I never had a father (1) can you understand that?...it denied me something, you know what I mean...yeah, well...most kids that age, they look up to their father, don’t they, they don’t look down ...you know I was a that age that they had (2) ah parent (2) you know father son, mother daughter things you know at the schools (2) and ahh (1) I didn’t want to go with my old man, I couldn’t (2) it had done something...you know what I mean ... it had created (2) um (1) yeah I I I [stutter] ah I would rather have felt like I never had anyone (2) that’s how I felt (2) I never had a father, you know (L659)

Apart from the instances laid out above, Noel does not see shame as figuring largely in his life. At the beginning of this section, the idea of family shame was raised. It is about this that Noel demonstrated a strong understanding of the way a family can instill shame in

its members. The following also converges with the area of witnessing shame in others. Noel talks about a family in his neighborhood who he describes as 'illiterate' and 'like hillbillies'. Noel had had a lot of trouble with the 4 brothers and had defended himself against them many times. Fed up, Noel confronted one of them who on this occasion was by himself.

...and I said to him... I called him a useless prick...and I called him a low life ... it actually taught me a lesson because I never ever saw the mother...she must have been dead or I don't know and I sez and I sez ahh like (1) um (1) something like (2) oh shit [trying to remember] something like (2) whoever your mother was, she must have been close to a vegetable ... this guy, he just (2) he just started to cry I felt actually sorry (1) I did [emph] feel sorry and like ... he was by himself, and I humiliated him...I really let him have it and... I didn't actually like what I'd done (4) yeh know but...I could see that he felt shame...because he whimpered ...like a kid with shingles... (2) and he just stood there and done it (2) it was horrible... they must have felt shame through just the way they lived life you know (2) yeah people like me I put him down, I put this guy down... I should have realized what I (1) well I meant to I was angry...(L348)

Shame and Anger

Noel clearly identifies shame and anger as early as 8 years old. In this episode, shame appears to precede anger. Noel is doubtful whether shame has any relationship to anger about the above mentioned, or at any other time in his life. However, a strong relationship between shame and anger does emerge from the data, which will be explored in the following.

At 8 years old, Noel incurred the wrath of his family for failing to complete an errand, the result being that his mother almost died. Through his father's and sibling's affective display of anger and disgust, Noel perceived the magnitude of his transgression. He describes the resulting feeling of shame in terms of being paralyzed, wanting to disappear, and a feeling of anguish. He was overcome at this point by actual shame affect.

According to Nathanson (1992), an affect once triggered will last only a short time, anywhere from a few seconds to a minute or two. In the case of shame, the affect gives away to a shame reaction, the possibilities of which are represented by the four poles of the compass of shame.

Noel's first defense against the pain of shame was to withdraw. He was overcome with fear and distress, two emotional states, which when co-assembled with shame, have the effect of drawing the shame experience out (Nathanson, p. 324). This defense is also associated with being 'overwhelmed' by the shame one is feeling (p. 312). Unable to remove himself physically, Noel retreated inwards.

In the ensuing weeks and months Noel kept a low profile. His need for affiliation may have inspired behavior from an *attack self* script, but withdrawal seems to have been the predominant strategy. He recalls that for many months after the incident, contact with other family members usually involved shaming. He was not allowed to forget what he had done, and everyone, including his mother, was involved in the project. If he was not being given the 'silent treatment', he was being verbally abused and castigated.

One could say that initially the bond was repairable, had his family been open to Noel's shame display. Their anger and contempt prevented this, and his shame represented a vulnerability, which was actively exploited by his family. His very existence became a punishment! It was this precise issue that gave fuel to Noel's anger. His anger derives from a cluster of feelings and thoughts, associated with the perception that he was judged unfairly (without a chance to speak) and that his guilt and punishment were permanent.

Noel's punishment was harsh and sadistic. The only way of protecting himself against shame-based feelings of rejection and abandonment was to distance himself from the family. His experience informed him that he wasn't cared about or respected. Yet he was a member of this family with love-based expectations). The tension here is analogous to ambivalence, a situation in which he is angry with the people he loves and needs to be loved by. To be denied that love is initially shaming, which may turn to anger and frustration at a later date. Unable to direct or express anger appropriately in the home, it manifested in delinquent tendencies, anti-social behaviors.

The next major episode of shame involved the degradation of Noel's father by his mother. This situation was ongoing and predictable. The cycle of Dad coming home drunk,

Mum abusing him physically and verbally and Dad taking it, came to a head when his mother, in a fit of anger, asked Noel to kill his father and take over as man of the house.

Noel recalls feeling ashamed of and angry with his father. It felt for him as though he had no father. He reduced shame by psychologically rejecting his father as his father. This is part of an *avoidance script*, wherein cognitions and emotions associated with their relationship are rearranged, in order to reduce shame. To have no expectation of one's father is less shaming, than to have high expectations and for them to be invariably disappointed. There is also a large element of *withdrawal* involved, wherein Noel made himself inaccessible to his father.

Again shame preceded anger. Noel was angry, that his father didn't stand up to his mother, that he accepted his humiliating and shame-bound position. Other possible emotions co-assembled with feelings towards his father may have been disgust and sadness, which would be associated with the loss of a pride-based relationship.

As a teenager and young adult, Noel was acutely sensitive to shaming. He recalls that most of his aggression was to do with feeling as though he was being put down or made a fool of. That is, it was in response to shaming by others. Because Noel felt justified in his aggression, he has no shame about the consequences of retaliation. From his teens onwards, it appears that Noel has operated out of an *attack other* script. He verbally attacked teachers, police, anyone in authority, generally took on an antagonistic attitude to such institutions.

In his late teens, Noel aligned himself with a motorcycle gang, a group that held similar attitudes to his. It should be noted that the anti-authoritarian attitudes held by Noel do seem to generate anger by themselves. While talking about the police and bureaucracy, Noel became very agitated, even angry. The attitudes themselves appear to be based on shame related beliefs, such as 'police treat you like a fool', or 'people who wear suits think they are better than you', or the 'government's just out to rip you off'. In this sense, contact with them results in lowered esteem, humiliation and shame. They are the enemy and thoughts about, or contact with 'them', seems to elicit a conditioned attack response in Noel. This is consistent with an *attack other* mode of behavior.

Within his marriage, Noel describes a lot of anger in connection with his wife. Several factors converged, all of them shame-related, which caused anger with an intensity

Noel had never experienced before or since. The mitigating factors were, his wife having an affair with his friend, and pressure from the threat of bankruptcy. In relation to the affair, everyone knew, but Noel. He knew, but couldn't get confirmation. Confrontation with his wife about it brought put-downs and abuse from his wife. He got the same demeaning, diminishing response from her about his financial demise. She openly attacked him as a 'non achiever' and as being 'weak', and he felt humiliated and disregarded.

He attempted to handle the situation through an *attack other script*, and he was primed for violence as a face saving measure. Unfortunately for Noel, his wife's lover died of a heart attack while the situation was unfolding. Noel was trapped between shame, grief and rage over his friend's death. He tried to control his emotions, but due to the intensity of his feelings, he came to the edge of a nervous breakdown.

Noel's anger was about being denied the truth, an inherently shaming scenario. The more he was denied it, the angrier he became. His mindset at the time was, that by dying, his friend had denied him his only opportunity for the truth and to restore his pride.

In summary, the relationship between shame and anger appears to be such that Noel's chronic anger originated in his family, as the result of prolonged shaming. Through this, Noel developed a sense of alienation from his family. Much of the subsequent anger reported by Noel manifests in relation to being made a fool of by others. It is apparent that Noel's acute sensitivity to being shame derives from his prolonged and deliberate shaming within his family.

His shame reaction strategies center on *withdrawal* and *attack other* scripts. As a child, withdrawal was the main strategy within the home, while avoidance was possibly a part of his public strategy for private shame. The attack other script seems to have emerged in his early teens, and dominated his life until his mid 30's. After that, Noel has chosen a quieter life style and appears to employ the *withdrawal* and *avoidance* scripts for shame modulation.

Case Study #9: Norman

Norman is 45 years old, of below average height and of light physique. He left school at 17 and completed 1 year of university studies. He has worked most of his adult life as a builder, although he has no formal qualifications in this area. He is living with a long-term partner and together they have 1 child. Norman has an adult daughter, and his partner a teenage daughter by previous relationships. As a family unit they have been responsible for their children's upbringing.

Norman has no history of violence, criminal convictions or alcohol abuse, although he has used drugs on a recreational basis.

Norman came across as a quiet and thoughtful person. His manner was relaxed, yet there was a sense of control about him. Norman was a cautious participant and seems to have been driven by a curiosity about the subject in question. Consequently he was willing to explore the relationship between shame and anger and tended towards a theoretical, rather than experiential perspective. Of a total of 304 lines of participant dialogue, 137 were devoted to shame and of these 56 were about personal shame. There were 65 questions giving an average of 4.6 lines per question. Answers were direct and brief, and there was no embellishment or wandering off the subject.

Emotionally, there was little overt variation during the interview; none of the lows seen in other participants. His mood was light and positive. As a person, Norman seemed slightly melancholic and had a feeling of sadness about him.

Anger

Norman was brought up in, what he describes, as a middle class environment. He is the middle of 3 boys. His father died when Norman was 11 years old. Prior to this Norman reports a good relationship between his parents. Because of the lost income, things became financially hard, and Norman did a lot to help out around the house. As a teen, he did house repairs and was generally supportive of his mother.

As far as discipline goes, Norman's family had an 'authoritative' style. There were rules that needed to be followed, but digression generally resulted in explanation and/or mild punishment. Of his childhood, Norman reports very little physical punishment and no violence in general. He was strapped 'once or twice' by his father, but had no fear of him. From 11 on, his mother would make him bend over and apply the hairbrush as best she could. Norman generally saw the punishment as fair and appropriate.

When asked about anger in his life, Norman begins in his early teens (12-13 years old). Prior to that he is not aware of anger, either in himself or in other members of the family. His anger as a teen resulted from conflict with his mother and usually involved her making, what appeared to Norman, as an unreasonable criticism:

...it usually [involved] me not fulfilling the expectation that she might have of me and that could simple things like ...I did repairs on the house, and I may have taken longer than she liked, so she would approach me about this, and it would develop into a rip snorting sort of an argument, and I'd get pretty cross and leave, and it would take a few days to dispel it, before we kind of resolved it (L22)

Although this was a regular occurrence over a certain period, Norman reports that generally he and his mother had a close and loving relationship. He recalls a very difficult time for the family around the time of his father's death. Besides his own grief, Norman was support to his mother, who for several years after his father died, suffered depression. Norman talks of her with admiration and respect, in view of the fact that, at the same time, she was also looking after her elderly mother and adjusting to a newborn Down's Syndrome baby.

As Norman reached his mid-late teens, he began to experiment with alcohol and drugs. He describes his relationship to drugs as recreational and experimental. While admitting to being a bit of a smoker, he does not consider himself to have had addiction issues.

On leaving school Norman attended university for 1 year, after which he dropped out. It was during this period that he began to move in what he describes as the 'alternative scene'. He held anti-establishment views and tended toward the darker side of the drug

scene (e.g. a range of drugs including opiates). He also embraced underground music and fashion. He does not recall being overly angry at this time.

Norman finds it difficult to locate significant anger in his adult years. He describes feelings of anger within his relationship, but nothing out of the normal range of conflict and disagreement. He describes getting 'cross' with his young son sometimes, when it comes to the arbitrary battle of the wills. But again nothing out of the ordinary.

One episode, which made Norman particularly angry, and which still does 10 years on, involved major repairs to his boat. The boat yard that did the repairs, did in Norman's opinion a sub-standard job, to the point that Norman felt he had to do the job again himself. Seeking restitution from the boat yard owner, Norman was shouted down, abused and evicted from the premises. No liability was taken by the yard owner. Norman reports feeling intimidated and traumatized as a result of this confrontation. His request for restitution was rejected, in what was for Norman a most humiliating way:

And I confronted him quite reasonably about it, and he basically yelled me, he's a big fat man, he yelled me out of his premises in front of his workmen (L318)

One of the key causes of anger for Norman was the blatant and purposeful act of injustice by the yard owner. His refusal to take responsibility for his work bordered on criminal abuse, from Norman's perspective. Norman was helpless to react, his whole system having shut down in the moment of aggression. He describes his reaction as 'passive'. Norman was in a situation, wherein he could only get 'justice' through the absolute domination of the other. But because he was the one who was overpowered and dominated, he had no choice but to retreat.

Norman was angry, and while he chose to express his anger to those around him (telling friends, etc.), the actual processing of anger took place in his fantasy world. He describes having violent fantasies, in which he is the powerful one, who annihilates his enemy over and over and in many different ways. These fantasies were for Norman the antidote to the helplessness and inadequacy he felt during the confrontation. When asked if he would actually fulfill his fantasies, Norman was adamant that he wouldn't, because he simply isn't comfortable with violence – he is not a violent person:

so I got really [angry] and had fantasies, you know I would have liked to have like lying in bed at night, I would imagine perhaps going in there and you know shoving his big fat ass into [laughs] the nearest rubbish bin and ahh, but I never came close to doing that... and I would never have in reality even got as far as hopping in my car to go down and do it ... not through fear of retaliation... it's just not in me to behave in that way, although I would definitely have enjoyed fantasizing about it you know (L318)

Ten years later, Norman says, he is still angry about it, and still fantasizes about his revenge:

...it was incredibly frustrating, cos he was quite wrong in what he did and the way he responded to me (2), and I'd still like to get him... I'd still like to do something nasty, (2) burn his factory down or something huh (L336)

Shame

Norman defines shame as a 'bad' feeling, which occurs as the result of actions that fall below his own standards of conduct. Initially, these standards 'are set for us by parents', and adult shame is to do with standards we set ourselves. Norman therefore sees shame as intricately bound with our moral system:

I tend to think of it as a personal thing in being ashamed of the way I've behaved ...because it's all about shame as related to a sort of a standard or a way of behaving that we set for ourselves or other people initially set it for us I guess, and it's when we go beyond that code that we become ashamed (L125)

Beginning with Norman's childhood, he describes his family environment as warm and caring. He recalls spending a lot of time with his father, and that he saw him as a hero. He recalls 'bragging' to other kids about what his father could do, and that overall he felt great pride in his father (and still does). His parents were both 'encouraging' and would

praise all their children. This situation did not change after Normans father died. As a child Norman remembers feeling confident and self-assured. Socially he recalls being popular at school and that he had a large group of friends.

When asked about shame and his childhood, Norman is adamant that he had not experienced it in any memorable quantity. He recalls ‘taking a bit of a ribbing’ from some of the ‘tough’ kids in primary school, because he was short and had ‘buckteeth’. But he recalls this was ‘normal stuff’, and that it was not an ongoing situation. He also had a slight speech impediment, but doesn’t remember any adverse attention because of this.

Norman discloses that his first encounter with shame occurred when he was 12-13 years old. He used to spend time in a park with friends, and one day a boy their age appeared with his sister:

and we befriended him and um (2) he offered us sex with his sister (2) and um (3) I went along with it, (2) and we went into some bushes, and my friend (2) I don’t think he penetrated her, but he certainly lay on top of her and (2) and had his penis between her legs and I at that point felt very uncomfortable and that it was quite the wrong thing to be doing, however I was involved in this event and ahh (3) I think the outcome was that ahh we got frightened, and (2) the kid had gone away in fact and got somebody and told on us, by which time it had finished [and when confronted by the adult] we denied it and ran away, and that was the end of the affair, but it had a very profound affect on me and it’s still (2) I look back and think it was very much a bad thing to have happened, (3) and I felt a lot of shame about that

What caused the feeling of shame? Even though Norman was not the perpetrator, he was still struck by the wrongness of the situation. His memory of the event is fuzzy, but he thinks he may have been affected by a sense of fear in the girl. That is, she had initially gone along with events, but at some point had ‘realized she was out of her depth’, possibly after realizing things were going beyond what she had previously experienced (her brother who had initiated the idea, had boasted that he had often had sex with his sister and that it was fun). In this context, at least in Norman’s mind, the event took on the characteristics of rape, and it is in this context that he feels ashamed to have been involved. Norman appears

to have shown a reasonable degree of empathy at the time, and obviously took no pleasure in the girl's discomfort.

Norman discloses, that he has told only one other person about this incident. He consciously kept it a secret for 32 years, because he was ashamed. Now, he says, he is too embarrassed to tell anyone about it, but he still feels the remnants of the initial shame feeling. In his mind it was simply a 'bad thing' to happen, but it produced a feeling of shame so profound that Norman has never been able to forget it.

I think that the biggest effect of it on me is, the way I felt after the event and for weeks afterwards it had a profound effect on me and it's probably the memory of that feeling and the effect that that feeling had on me, that's stayed with me rather than the event itself (L302)

As mentioned above, Norman began to move into the hippy/alternative scene during his teens. He established his identity within underground culture and therefore in opposition to many mainstream values. His explanation about this rests on the idea that it was the middle of the 1960's, and movements of this nature were new and appealing to a wide cross-section of youth. Up until and including this period, Norman was doing well at school and was well adjusted in general. In spite of teenage rebellion, he stayed at home until 18 years old, at which time he attended university.

While his mother had trouble coping with some of his teenage ways, Norman recalls generally feeling accepted by his mother. While the idea that university and maybe a profession were an advantage, the alternative route that Norman took was respected, and he was never made to feel 'bad' about his choices. Work, having fun, and travelling characterize his youth and early adult years. He had no ambition to become a professional, and preferred to work with his hands. He gained experience on building sites and worked extensively as a self-employed builder. He is good at what he does and takes a great deal of pride in his work.

In general and including his family, Norman is proud of his accomplishments. He has always felt comfortable with who he is and how he has lived his life. He is in a long-

term stable relationship and his children are well adjusted and secure. He is and has always been dedicated to family life, and takes pleasure in things domestic.

Norman's mother died of smoking related emphysema. Norman also smokes. He says, that he feels ashamed of this, because he has seen his mother die from it, yet he enjoys smoking and continues to do it. He is not ashamed of smoking per se; he is ashamed that he still smokes knowing it could kill him. Apart from smoking, Norman does not consider shame to have been a significant part of his adult life. If it was there, it was short lived. When asked how he deals with shame, Norman says:

well I think the knee jerk reaction is to fob it off ... I think it is something I would prefer not to think about... I think, if an element of shame comes into my psyche my instant reaction is to fob it off ...I don't want to think about it, (2) because I'm ashamed of it, therefore it makes me feel bad so I'll say to myself, I won't think about that (L163)

Shame and Anger

Norman does not recall shame or anger in his childhood. Rather he describes a close family environment, with a loving caring atmosphere. He feels he was treated with respect by his parents, and was praised and encouraged by them. His father died when he was 11 years old. He was and still is proud of his father, with whom he had a close relationship. Also with his mother he had a close and loving relationship. In the past he didn't, nor has he now, any resentment or unresolved issues with them.

With his father's diagnosis of cancer, Norman's family entered into a period of trauma, which put enormous stress on the family. Norman recalls little of his own feelings connected with this time. What he does remember as significant is his mother's grief and anguish, which he recalls distracted him from his own grief over his father. In this sense, his anguish was over witnessing his mother's desperation and depression over the next 2-3 years, which he describes as profound.

At 13 years old, Norman was sexually curious. It is important to view the sexual encounter described above from the standpoint of a 13 year old, rather than from an adult

point of view. He describes the encounter in the park in the context of sexual exploration and discovery. The rules and standards of sexual exchange were not fully known and were being constructed through a process of experimentation. An opportunity arose to advance sexual experience and was taken up by Norman and his friend.

The shame that Norman felt after of this encounter emanated from within him and was the result of his own perception of the wrongness of the situation. The trigger, according to Norman, was seeing fear in the girl. What seemed a moment before to be an act of pleasure went past a threshold, which set alarm bells ringing. It is likely that fear was the initial emotion, which in turn alerted all involved to the wrongness of what was happening and was therefore a cue to stop. It is also likely that there was fear over getting caught and exposed. But for Norman there was shame long after the fear had died down.

Norman coped with the shame by hiding it. This approach is consistent with Nathanson's withdrawal script. Nathanson surmises that, not only is withdrawal a 'normal' reaction to shame, it may also be 'essential to the formation of a normal personality'. This may be true in Norman's case. The incident outlined appears to have been an aberration. It may be seen as a deviation across a moral line and shame was the consequence. It was so painful that Norman would not go there again. Fearing that he would be judged badly for his involvement, Norman kept the whole thing a secret.

Norman felt he had let himself down and was mildly angry with himself for this. However he does not identify anger as significantly associated with the event. This may be because there were no outside consequences afterwards. He wasn't caught for anything, nor was he punished in any way by 'others' or made to feel ashamed of what he was involved in. Therefore the intensity of his anger never reached a level he remembered as anger.

The theme of withdrawal, shame and anger can be seen in the conflicts Norman had with his mother (see anger section above). He describes a typical scenario as him being criticized by his mother for being too slow to finish a job. An argument would follow, and Norman would 'storm off'. Things would cool down in 2-3 days, and the incident would be forgotten. In the present context, Norman's mother was shaming him by drawing attention to his slowness. He saw himself as meticulous and wanting to do a good job, and so felt his mother was putting him down.

Norman's walking away from conflict with his mother is consistent with a withdrawal script. It seems that in these instances Norman was involved in what many writers describe as the shame/rage/shame cycle. Norman felt put down and shamed by his mother. He felt the need to defend himself and became angry. Sensing that an escalation would place the bond between them in jeopardy, Norman withdrew. His own angry reaction to his mother then becomes a source of shame, and this shame becomes a source of anger. This is the essential dynamic of what H.B. Lewis calls the shame spiral. Withdrawal can be of varying intensity, from averting the eyes to suicide (Nathanson, 1992, p. 321). In Norman's case it was over within a short time, and both participants would symbolically show their shame to the other and carry on with a little more sensitivity to the other. Within this interaction, shame can be seen as a conciliatory force.

Next, the conflict with the boat repairman will be considered. A straightforward repair on Norman's boat was substandard. Norman's request for compensation was ignored, and so he re-approached the man on several occasions. Operating from an attack other script, the repairman shouted Norman off his premises, thus humiliating Norman and rendering him powerless. In order to avoid the considerable amount of shame involved, Norman initially withdrew. Withdrawal can be synonymous with retreating and licking the wounds.

Out of frustration and indignation, Norman became angry and entertained plans for revenge. But he is not a violent or confrontational person and so revenge was taken within his fantasy world. He describes having violent fantasies, which were fuelled by his anger, over a long period. Put in the same position, Andrew, Albert or Arthur, no doubt would have done what Norman fantasized about. But Norman also had to justify to himself his passivity and lack of face-saving action.

In order to do this Norman did what is commonly done, he reinterpreted, justified and minimized his course of action/inaction. This is part of an avoidance pattern, which is common in situations in which the subject of shame is helpless by any other means (e.g. attack other), to modulate shame (Nathanson, 1992, p. 342). For Norman this involved the sharing of the story in all its detail, but instead of saying 'I feel ashamed for not standing up to that bully', he adopts a position in which he says 'I am comfortable with the way I acted'. This is the only example of the myriad ways in which an individual can reinterpret

a situation with the goal of making himself or herself look better (both to themselves and others) than they feel.

For Norman the situation was not resolved, although he reports the violent fantasies gave him a certain amount of pleasure. He says that, in hindsight, he would have felt better about himself, if he had 'reacted angrily' instead of passively. He is still angry and expresses the desire to 'break [the repairman's] kneecaps'. In other words he is angry, because he lost face and did not take action, which was consistent with the restoration of his pride. Within the context of this study, Norman's behavior falls within the normal range of behavior. To a degree that is consistent with his image of himself, Norman accepts his passivity as a credible alternative to violent confrontation, which by Norman's reckoning would have ended in utter humiliation for him.

In summary, at 12 years old Norman was involved in a sexual incident, which resulted in him feeling for several weeks after, a deep sense of personal shame. Ostensibly, shame arose because Norman judged his own behavior as below that standard which is morally acceptable. In connection with his shame he describes what could be called mild anger at himself. His anger was of the character associated with a situation in which someone has unwittingly come close to causing serious harm to themselves or others. An accompanying sentiment might be – no harm done, but that was bad, and I won't let it happen again.

Norman reacts to shaming by his mother with anger. To avoid escalation he retreats, sometimes for days. Conciliation takes place when each shows the other that they feel bad (ashamed) of their own behavior. Regarding Norman's reaction to the bullying boatman, the repairman shamed Norman, and because he was intimidated, Norman backed down from the conflict. He therefore felt shame about his passivity. He was also angry at the time, but feared to express his anger. It seems likely therefore that he felt shame about his fear.

Case Study #10: Nigel

Nigel is 44 years old, of medium height and of powerful build. He is currently separated, and has several children in their mothers care. He was expelled from school at 15 without formal qualification. He is a trained spray painter and has worked extensively on oilrigs. At the time of the interview he was unemployed. He has a history of alcohol and drug abuse as well as violence. He has no criminal convictions that the researcher is aware of.

Nigel comes across as a 'man's man'. He is physically fit and strong, and this is reflected in his posture. He stayed on his feet for much of the interview, moving about in an agitated way. His manner was forthright, and he was eager to talk. However he was not particularly open to the interview process and used several methods to steer it. For example, interrupting - sudden changes in subject – overt annoyance when pressed on subject. His speech was rapid and he left very few pauses between words.

Out of a total of 471 lines of participant text Nigel devoted 36-40 to direct talk about shame. This is comparatively low and signals a resistance to talking about it. For 471 lines there were 72 questions asked (av.=6.5 lines/quest.).

There was a lot of variation in volume and intensity of his voice, for example mumbling almost inaudibly when talking about shame. He became angry when talking about anger, and took on a shamed countenance when talking about shame. This reflects a highly variable emotional state during the interview. His emotional baseline is described as agitated.

Anger

Nigel was brought up in suburban New Zealand in a working class environment. His mother was overtly Seventh Day Adventist, and his father became religious in order to marry her. Nigel's mother is described as quiet, nonassertive, and not really fitting in to the surrounding culture. Nigel describes his father as 'an angry man', but a good dude', who had 'short mans syndrome' and 'always had a point to prove', and didn't like loosing. He

was aggressive and domineering within the family context in the sense that he reserved the right to act as he saw fit. He recalls that his father worked a lot and was 'never there'. He never ate meals with the family except on Saturdays (the Sabbath).

For his childhood up until middle teens, Nigel observed religious convention, which included no swearing, no playing sport on Saturday, no going out to birthdays on Friday or Saturday, etc. This made it difficult for Nigel and his younger brother to fit into conventional life. He describes the frustration of always having to explain to people why he couldn't do these things. Ostensibly, the rules of his religion clashed with those of his school, social and sporting life. He describes getting a 'hard time' from kids and coaches because they did not understand these rules. He was teased in his early primary school years.

Within his church-going world things were difficult as well. He was not as devout as the other children and was not accepted by them. Friction was evident from an early age and periodically ended in fighting. Nigel explains that he didn't fit into either lifestyle and felt alienated from a young age. The difficulties encountered were highlighted by the differences between their parents. In this context, Nigel was torn between two very different worlds.

Nigel says that although he was shy as a child, he realized he needed a strategy for survival. He was good at sport and he capitalized on his popularity. He shrugged off the teasing and was liked for it. He became 'the wise guy' in his class, and the kid who acted as though nothing affected him.

... I learned to talk and I was popular because I was the underdog and just sort of brushed it off [and I was good at lots of things] ...(L116)

The turning point in relation to anger came when Nigel was 10 years old. His teacher had decided Nigel was a 'smart Alec' and picked on him. One particular day Nigel was sitting next to someone who was talking when they shouldn't have. The teacher blamed Nigel and Nigel did not tell on his friend. He talked back and tried to defend himself. But the teacher was adamant and Nigel was strapped.

...normally it didn't worry me but this time it did because I was not talking and my dickhead gutless friend ...never [owned up]... I thought you gutless bastard...I was really angry at him, I was totally angry....the teacher came up to me about 20 mins later [after the strap] and said what's the attitude for (2) and then I turned around and I got a bit [inaudible] and I said what do you think (2) and he sez don't speak to me like that and I sez well I am because you called me a liar and gave me the strap for something that I didn't do and he sez you're still calling me a liar (L69)

To resolve the matter the teacher decided to have a mock court case. Nigel pleaded his case and then the teacher his. Nigel lost the vote by one,

...and that's when I cried... I don't [bloody] cry but by [hell] it wasn't crying because I was weak I was just [extremely] angry... I've never forgotten and I never ever will...being proved wrong and being called a liar that really [made me angry] and I never trusted - I just remember that point ...and I went home and told mum about it and she [throws up his arms as if to say didn't want to know] that's exactly what happened [emph] you know it's indelibly printed on my memory I'll never forget it (L79)

Nigel describes his tenth year as the year he 'came out of [himself]'. That is, he went from being 'shy' to being outgoing and outspoken. Part of this change seems to involve an emerging mistrust – resentment of adults, which in part involved his teacher and also a lack of support by his parents. Nigel describes his mother as uninterested and not listening to him, and his father as unavailable.

I never saw dad enough to explain it to him he was too fucking busy [emph on whole sentence] you know what I mean... SHIT LIKE THAT! ...well it was either sink or swim (2) and I was getting shit and I could have just gone down...into the fetus position and become a... head case... but how I coped with it I became popular with the other kids [brainy kids and tough kids] ...(L92)

At 16 years old Nigel's parents separated and Nigel stayed with his mother. By this time he had developed anti-social attitudes and was engaging in anti-social behavior. He had severed all connection with the church and was spending weekends away from home.

He was 'kicked out of school at 15, and at 16 began an apprenticeship as a spray-painter. Meanwhile, what had begun as an interest in motorcycles, had developed into involvement in a local motorcycle gang. Gang life and values are the opposite of those held by Nigel's parents, and he sees his involvement as part of his rebellion against his parents:

should have been in the army like the old man said... action speed women, scaring people, watching people fuckin shiver when you walk in with your kraut lid [german helmet] or riding past a family and they look at you disdainfully yeah it's great... you're the outlaws man, you're the king of the ... roost (2) fuck the law (2) fuck lawnmower land...(L344) it sort of shaped us and rebelling totally against Mum and Dad you know just totally ... rebelling (2) like you know our idols we had pictures of Sunny Barger ...the president of the Hells Angels up on the wall...they were heroes (2) they weren't goody goodies... you know the goody goody ... image that went by the wayside for me... (L359)

The gang environment is described by Nigel as 'an angry scene', which revolved around inter-gang violence and issues of hierarchy and honor within gangs. Status is achieved basically through the shaming of weaker members by more powerful ones. 'Saving face' is the equivalent of avoiding shame, and is paramount if one is to maintain status. Anger is an integral part of this system and is interwoven into the complexity of gang related social life. It is part of the uniform.

Anger is also the expected reaction to shaming within the gang world. Nigel outlines a situation wherein a would-be leader stripped him of his 'rank' by assigning him a new and demeaning nickname. Not to become angry and retaliate was to lose face. Saving face required that Nigel 'beat' his adversary, thus humiliating him. Through anger and violence Nigel was able to do this, thereby reinstating honor and pride, not just for him but also for those loyal to him.

Even though Nigel has long since left this environment, he is still very angry. When questioned about his anger, he reels off a list of 'institutions which make him angry:

I: would you characterize yourself as an angry person?

P: oh yeah I hate bureaucracy, I think there's a lot of (2) I think this life has got a heavy middle belly of people who just pass papers and make laws and ... milk society and I don't trust or listen, I hate real estate agents...all these scam artists... what makes them [paper shufflers] think they should get more money than me. ...they just sit in offices and work computers...to me that's ... nothing! ...[it's] their heir of superiority... if it wasn't for the money that they've milked...they wouldn't even have had the experiences that they've had.... To me they haven't really earned it (L373)

Nigel comes across as a humorous and tolerant character. He sees himself as having a deep understanding of the dynamics of social interaction. For example he doesn't mind being made a fool of and can laugh when he is the butt of a joke or prank that is associated with initiation into a group (e.g., being the junior in a new job). His reaction though depends on his perception of the joker's intentions. His anger is triggered if the other person is making a fool of him in order to make them look better. Within the interview Nigel names at least 5 people who have earned his vexation through such circumstances. All are from his childhood and youth.

Shame

Nigel has a lot of difficulty defining shame. He sees 'basic shame' as resulting from a transgression – you do something wrong and you feel bad. He also associates shame with fear – you feel ashamed that you are scared of something. Shame for Nigel is also about not achieving goals.

Shame, according to Nigel, was not part of his childhood experience. He suggests that people saw him as a shy easygoing child, who was 'always smiling'. But he did feel like 'a bit of an outsider', an 'underdog', and says he was 'a bit embarrassed sometimes' about his religious background. He felt his religious background set him aside from his peers, and that the weekend restrictions that went with it caused him to stand out. For example, explaining to friends and their parents why he could not attend birthdays on weekends was difficult. In the face of his school friends then Nigel felt some shame about

his difference from them. But this was somewhat compensated for by his likeable nature and the fact that he was good at things such as schoolwork and sport. He attempted to merge himself within his peer group and to the extent he could, he integrated himself into normal school-based social life.

As mentioned above, at 10 years old, Nigel experienced a shaming situation that he says changed his life. He was accused of something he didn't do, and not believed when he told what he saw as the truth. Then thinking his whole class was behind him, he was voted against, and found guilty of lying as well. On top of this he cried in front of his class and the teacher, against whom he had been trying to stand up to. Then his mother dismissed his appeals of injustice saying she didn't want to know.

On the surface Nigel appeared to cope. He said he became popular with the other kids to the point that at 11-12 years old he was elected as a prefect at school. But after the incident with the teacher, Nigel became angry and oppositional towards adults including teachers. Consequently he was often in trouble and often got 'strapped'. His young brother and his friends saw Nigel as a tough guy, who never cried when he got 'the strap'.

...because my brother was in the class next door I had to go [into the class next door to fetch the strap]...I'd see my brother saying ohh [Norman] is getting the strap again [laughs] ...and of course to them I was the big hard man you know...[but] I wasn't ... (105)

The picture so far is of Nigel being shamed by others. He retaliates by trying to appear as if it doesn't worry him or affect him. This is consistent with the observation that from an early age, Nigel appears to have been cognizant of the way different identities can be worn like costumes, and that appearances are everything. But underneath the tough bravado, Nigel was not coping.

... every time I got the strap mum would always say ohh well you probably deserved it... I pissed the bed whenever I got in the shit right up until ahh I left that school [12-13years old]... if I got the strap I wouldn't cry or nothing but invariably the next morning I'd wake up and I'd wet the bed and I was the oldest... can you imagine how

that fucking felt (2) especially when your mum didn't fucking () listen to ya, I never saw dad enough to explain it to him he was too fucking busy (L88)

It is likely that Nigel felt embarrassment about bedwetting, and that it was a situation he was obviously not proud of. It was kept a secret in order to avoid being humiliated and shamed. He appears to blame his parents for the situation.

After being ejected from school, Nigel took an apprenticeship with his father's auto spray-painting firm. He experienced what many young apprentices go through when starting out. He was the subject of many pranks and was made fun of. For example, he was a virgin until he was 17, and this was public knowledge at work. Consequently, he was chastised and labeled a homosexual by some fellow workers. That is, he was shamed. Although he recalls 'hating it', he tried to appear unaffected by it. He declares though, that if he saw the guy who used to say it, he would happily 'give him a slap round the ...ear'.

Nigel said little about his relationship to his father during the interview. In the following excerpt, he talks about the humiliation his father caused him while he worked for him.

But ah working with Dad was sometimes funny... like um Dad sometimes didn't take me seriously and I'd go to him with a problem when I was 16 or 17 and all of a sudden it would become common smoko shop ... knowledge (2) and the guys would take the piss out of me, his workers and that... that's why I never take the piss out of young [people] because I know how I felt, yeah I was ... angry (L322)

Nigel gives many examples of this nature like starting a job and having to go through the mandatory humiliation period required of juniors. However, Nigel sees this as par for the course, and one is expected to go through it with good grace.

Nigel is a self-styled 'man about town'. He has for the last 10 years earned good money working on oilrigs. After a 'stint' he would 'hit town' and spend up large - drinking and women. He is also married with two 10-12 year old children. His wife found out about an affair he was having and left him. He describes feeling a deep sense of shame over this. His shame is that he has lost his family because of his actions. This incidentally is the only

shame Nigel admits to in his life. He is full of regret and is experiencing bouts of depression. He has no job, and is staying in his ex-wife's sleep-out.

Nigel seems to be involved in a shame spiral, wherein one shame based outcome spreads to related areas causing more shame. For example, Nigel had a job, money, the high life, good reputation and family two years ago. He lost his family – felt responsible and shamed. He began drinking heavily (spent \$20, 000 in 6 months in bars). This affected his work, and his reputation went from reliable good worker to unreliable. He couldn't find work, and no work meant no money, and therefore the need to find work. He is unable to find work and is experiencing depression and a sense of hopelessness. On the shame/pride axis, all of these circumstances represent shame-based experiences.

Shame and Anger

Several opposing tensions are identifiable from the above. The first is between Nigel's family/religious duties and his nonreligious school/social life. He felt he didn't fit into either world. Being different attracted unwanted attention and Nigel was, from a young age, exposed to a subtle wash of shame-related experiences. Teasing, not being understood or respected by other children because he couldn't play sport or go to birthdays on weekends, all converged to form a cluster of shame-based feelings.

It appears that Nigel controlled these feelings with strategies associated with the *attack self script*. As a child he was shy and likeable. Within Nathanson's (1992) conception of shame modulation, shyness is a way of functioning at a level that incorporates an acceptance of one's shame, yet also masks or hides a sense of self-worth 'far in excess of what is broadcast' (p. 330). At no point in the interview does Nigel refer to himself as having low self-esteem, low self-worth, or a sense of inferiority. He was aware that the differences between him and the other children were related to his religious background, and were not due to a personal defect. Therefore his shyness was connected with uncertainty about his social acceptability rather than a shamed self.

The *attack self script* is seen as an affiliative strategy. Fitting in and being accepted was important for Nigel as it is for children in general. His strategy for gaining popularity was to shrug off put-downs and other shaming attacks, to pretend he wasn't worried, and

that he was above taking it personally. To laugh it off, treat it as a joke was better than showing distress and thereby making himself vulnerable. Instead of becoming isolated, people were endeared to Nigel. He became 'one of the boys' and describes himself as friendly with both the 'tough kids and the brainy kids'.

The turning point for Nigel came when he was 10 years old, with the conflict between him and his teacher. Nigel's persona exuded confidence and cockiness. His teacher reportedly saw fit to bring him down a notch or two through public shaming. Nigel recalls that he was regularly 'picked on' prior to the event in question, but had managed to 'rise above it'. But the seriousness of the outcome for Nigel concerning the conflict in question was too much for his existing strategies. Even though he continued with an attack self strategy, the conflict had changed him. He was humiliated in front of peers, framed as a liar, and treated with disrespect by his teacher. He was angry at the injustice of being blamed and then shamed for something he did not do.

Nigel's sense of injustice and humiliation was compounded by his parent's lack of support. He feels his mother never acknowledged him at all, and that his father was too busy to even tell. This event triggered a process of increasing mistrust of and alienation from adults by Nigel. He had been violated and there was no intervention or reckoning sought by his parents. Although he attempted to cope alone, wetting his bed was a sign that his coping strategies were insufficient.

After this event, Nigel said he got tough. He became aggressive and began to operate out of an *attack other script*. Already sensitized to put-downs and shaming by others, he said he began to adopt his father's approach of hit first, ask questions later. This occurred in the context of his popularity and acceptance by his peers and was not a regular occurrence. He was also more antagonistic towards teachers and generally disruptive in school. He was caught in a cycle wherein oppositional behavior led to stricter censure by teachers, which further ingrained anti-authority attitudes. By the time was asked to leave school, the pattern of oppositional behavior towards those in authority was well developed.

Working for his father, Nigel was exposed to shaming by his work mates as well as his father. He was humiliated when his father shared confidential information with his workmates. He also felt betrayed by his father, which fed into the picture of authority figures as untrustworthy. He handles the work situation with bravado and humor as part of

the *attack self script*. He was also the boss's son, and was therefore expected to take and accept the humiliation that is inherent in the trade-oriented workplace. But he was also deeply resentful and angry at being made fun of. His anger was channeled into proving his worth and that he was better than those who put him down.

He describes himself as a perfectionist in his trade. Perfectionism and the pursuit of excellence are seen within the current context as part of an avoidance script. Failure would have not only brought shame and humiliation on his father, but would have left Nigel open to the shaming attention of others including workmates and family. Avoidance is the script of attainment designed to foster pride as a mask for shame. It is a mask because it does not take away the source of shame, but it draws attention away from it. It confounds the observer.

Similarly, as one can hide behind achievement, one can borrow pride by riding with a motorcycle gang. Within the gang context, Nigel took on the identity of the outlaw. He describes the feeling of satisfaction in scaring people, seeing fear in 'mister middle class' and his wife, giving the finger to the police, etc.. He describes in euphoric terms the feeling of being on his bike feeling like the 'king of the roost'. This is part of an *attack other script* in which one's self esteem is elevated through the reduction of another's.

The identity of gang member was ostensibly as far away as Nigel could get from recognizable shame. Implicit within the logic of intra and inter gang violence is the notion of anger used for the avoidance of shame. To loose is to be shamed and to be shamed is to retaliate with anger. Alternatively, to accept defeat is to accept shame and a corresponding inferior position.

When Nigel was caught cheating on his wife, and consequently lost his family, he was forced to accept shame. But his shame in this context did not have the overtly angry reaction to it. Even during the interview, when talking about this particular situation, Nigel became comparatively quiet, his speech became disjointed and sentences faded into a mumble. He originally reacted with alcohol and drugs – part of an avoidance script. He describes the need to get back onto an oilrig where he can forget about the pain. He also states that that maybe it is just his fate to be the eternal party animal and pleasure seeker. This is all part of a pattern of disavowal and the reinterpretation of reality associated with avoidance strategies for shame modulation.

What is noticeable with Nigel is that although he is at a low ebb in his life, brought about largely by his own actions, his discourse is predominantly blaming and demeaning of others. Talk about his own feelings about his transgression is minimal. It appears that the lower he had sunk, the lower his sensitivity to other people's superiority over him has grown. Nigel's response to this is from an *attack other script* wherein he seeks to reduce whole segments of the population (i.e., 'paper shufflers') to a lower level. In this way anger that would otherwise be directed at himself is displaced onto an anonymous population. The world then is full of exploiters and 'scammers', whereas he is an honest and noble human being.

In summary, Nigel felt that his family's strict adherence to the religious doctrine (Seventh Day Adventist) he was brought up with alienated him from his peers. He was exposed to shaming by peers. He coped with it through an *attack self script* which involved shyness.

Around 10 years old he reports that he reached a point where he 'was sick of being kicked around all the time', and began to 'stick up' for himself. He operated from an *attack other script* which centered on the anger he felt as a result of shaming by others including significant adults.

As an adult Nigel was already sensitized to shaming by others. He reacted from a combination of *attack other*, *attack self*, and *avoidance scripts*. Anger is particularly associated with matters of comparison to others. Overall there is an ongoing process, which centers on the diminution of individuals and institutions associated with authority and conformity.

More recently, Nigel has experienced intense and prolonged shame as a result of his own actions. He has attempted to cope with it through avoidance, a rearrangement of reality in which he is ultimately the victim.

Case study # 11: Neil

Neil is 28 years old, and is married with 4 young children. He left school at 17 years old, having attained sixth form certificate. He has no formal vocational training. He is a self-taught guitarist and is currently working as a self-employed musician. He has no history of addiction or substance abuse, and no known criminal record.

Neil came across as self-confident and slightly melancholic. He was friendly and generally relaxed. He assured the interviewer that he was happy to talk about any aspect of his life 'no problem'. The interview was brisk and answers were relatively short and to the point. 81 questions yielded 313 lines of participant text (average = 3.8 lines/question). This reflects an inclination by Neil to keep the conversation on a reasonably superficial level (mentioned in field notes), especially when talking about himself. As well, Neil acknowledges that he sees little point in talking about the past, and prefers to 'just get on with the job'.

Neil was a clear speaker although he would occasionally fade off into a mumble. There were few pauses between words. Emotionally he was stable throughout the interview, and had a baseline emotional state somewhere between melancholic and contentment.

Anger

Neil is the only boy in a family of 5 children from a marriage that is intact. His parents are market gardeners. He observes their relationship as loving and supportive. He does not recall an argument between them and says they always treated each other with respect. They are 'full of self-belief' which Nigel says has spilt over onto the children. Neil describes himself as a child as having 'high self-esteem' and self-confidence. He thought he could do anything, and that his parents encouraged this.

Neil remembers his childhood as 'great' and says that given the chance he 'would do it again. He describes his father as a fair and good man whom he idolized then and now. When Neil was 5 years old his eldest sister died and sent his family into 'silent grief'. His

parents never talked about it then or since. Neil surmises that his father coped by working, and describes him as a workaholic. Both parents, and consequently the whole family, existed on a practical level, and avoided emotional interaction

not a lot of cuddling (2) so there wasn't the physical touch or the emotional or verbal (3) it was never really spoken about... we lived life on a very physical plane... a very literal plane ...everything was just very literal it was like ... didn't really talk about anything spiritual or um emotional or things like that were very rarely spoken about (2) it was more we'd talk about actual things that were happening like something that's real ...where some families might talk about (2) Hinduism or something we would talk about tables (2) or cars or something do you know what I'm saying (2) we very rarely digressed into (2) deep conversation (L46)

Discipline and punishment involved being 'smacked' or 'sent to your room', and was dealt with by Neil's father. It was not severe or inappropriate and seemed to Neil to be in proportion to a transgression. Neil also feared his father, but only in connection with punishment. He said he knew when he had over-stepped the boundaries, and that imminent punishment would instill fear into him, which would disappear soon after. Of his mother, Neil has no memory of fear at all.

The predominant negative emotion of Neil's childhood was sadness and grief. Anger was limited to moments of frustration with other siblings. He remembers his sister 'winding' him up to the point where he would react with anger. This was a common reason for Neil being punished, and it is in this context that he recalls his father becoming angry with him. But neither his nor his father's anger was long lasting, and was confined to acute episodes, which were quickly forgotten. In general, Neil remembers his parents as 'lenient', and physical punishment being used only as a last resort. Instead his parents took time to talk about the wrongdoing, and impressed onto the children the notion of reciprocity; do unto others, as you would have them do unto you. Taking the other's perspective was an important element in Neil's family experience.

Also within the family, Neil learned to deal with anger by 'letting it go'. This was his parents 'style'. Neil recalls an incident in which his parents, when faced with a serious violation of their trust by an employee (\$7,000 was stolen), reacted with humility,

choosing to 'let it go' rather than pursue retribution. Neil surmises that losing their daughter had caused a reprioritizing of their values, and that punishment or retribution simply weren't that important to them.

As a teenager, Neil was very much tied to family and home. He describes himself as being 'a bit 'socially withdrawn, and instead of being out with other teenagers, he chose to sit in his room and practice his guitar. He doesn't remember himself as angry at this time, rather he had more of a tendency towards being melancholic.

His social life came to revolve around sport and music. He has never smoked cigarettes, taken drugs or drunk alcohol, either as a teen or at present. He also tended to mix with people who refrained from drugs and alcohol. He describes himself as a young adult, as easy going and focused on a career in pop music. He was mildly successful, but decided to go traveling instead of pursuing his music career. Much of his early adult life was spent travelling, working and always playing music. He considered himself a mellow person who was more than content with his adventurous lifestyle.

When Neil talks about significant anger in his life, he refers to that which he has experienced since being married. It is worth noting that they work together at night, are renovating their house during the day, and have 4 children together

that's pretty much it believe it or not (2) I've never known or been involved in the anger that [wife] can provoke (2) other than that I've never felt like that (2) till I met [wife] I never felt really angry (2) violently angry (L197)

Neil describes his wife as coming from a background of violent abuse, and that she has a lot of issues as a result. He views his wife as quite angry, and in a very general sense says he feels angry that he has to deal with her anger. Within the family context Neil has an expectation of harmony and cooperation, and he sees his wife as constantly frustrating his ideal.

On a more specific level Neil describes their conflicts, which are regular, as centering around mutual frustration. For example, he is not concerned with mess in the house and she is. He is often absent minded (the result of trying to do too much), and she thinks he forgets things that relate to her needs or wishes on purpose. In this context, the

triggers are 'usually small' things, which are insignificant to Neil. He gets angry over the disruption of harmony and peace over something trivial.

Neil says he likes to deal with things on the spot, and his own outburst of anger is quickly over. But he says his wife tends to withdraw and 'snipe' with 'little comments' of a belittling nature. As well, she gives him the 'silent treatment', and the 'cold shoulder', and this 'usually' lasts for 3 days

...it always escalates from something small (2) but she'll have like 3 or 4 days at least (3) of me getting the cold shoulder (2) kind of (2) of things not being right you know [inaudible] and after 3 or 4 days or 2 or whatever I just feel worn through trying to tippy-toe around her all the time (3) and then! I've just had enough...quite often around that stage she's starting to come right (2) then I've had enough... that's almost always the time things get out of hand (L265)

Things getting out of hand can mean anything from Neil having violent fantasies about his wife, or more typically, going outside and screaming. Occasionally he has hit the wall with his fist. He describes her typical reaction as 'storming out' announcing that the marriage is over.

Through this experience, Neil sees his anger as being generally closer to the surface, and that his tolerance level is now significantly lower than it has ever been. Recently he was involved in a road rage incident, in which he confronted the driver of a car that was 'tail gating' him. He reacted to the drivers 'sarcasm' and demeaning comments by knocking the gentleman's glasses off and standing on them. He is very proud of this, and comments that he now 'refuses to take crap' from people.

In an unrelated incident, Neil was walking past 2 youths, and was without provocation, hit over the head with a bottle by one of them. Feeling outnumbered and intimidated, he went back to his hotel room to find a weapon. His urge to retaliate was short lived, but he describes the anger as intense and like nothing he had ever experienced. Central was the mindlessness and callousness of the act of aggression, as well as the possible seriousness of the outcome. Neil is not a violent person, and rather than get mixed up in a confrontation in which he would be out of his depth, he decided to 'let it go'.

Shame

Neil has difficulty defining shame. He offers no formal definition, but from the text it appears that he associates it with transgressing boundaries that result in another person getting emotionally hurt. In this context, shame occurs as the result of an action.

As mentioned above, as a child, Neil saw himself as having high self-esteem and confidence. His family was close and he 'knew' his parents loved him and his siblings. Interestingly, there was no talk of love and there was apparently very little physical affection within the family. Neil says his feeling of security and of being loved came from 'a general vibe' wherein his parents showed their love through nurturance and respect.

Neil was never 'put down' by his parents, nor abused verbally. The only thing that stands out for him is his father saying '...how am I going to get it through your thick head, not to hit your sister'. Although he remembers it Neil does not recall being affected by it. In fact his father recently disclosed that he had always 'felt bad' about it, and apologized.

Neil's only childhood recollection of shame came about from a conflict with one of his sisters.

... when I was a kid I was at my grandparents place and my sister was winding me up just after my other sister had died and to upset her I shouted out my sisters name who had died 10 times in a row and she got really upset (2) I felt ashamed about that (2) for a long time (2) I still do probably but there's nothing I can do about it (L344)

The shame involved here obviously resulted from Neil's actions, and given the sensitivity surrounding his sister's death, his utterance probably inspired self-disgust as well as guilt. But he was around 6 years old at the time, and through having his own children, now understands that children are apt to say hurtful things to each other.

Towards the end of the interview, Neil opens up more about his adult shame. Around 19-20 years old, Neil was in a successful band, complete with groupies. He describes feeling 'a bit ashamed' of the way her treated some of the girls who hung around the band. He was sexually prolific at the time and feels he used these girls for his own pleasure without regard for their feelings

[I was a] sort of arrogant ego maniac I suppose ...thoughtless (3) like the world centered around me ... I took on a bit of a rock star persona maybe ...[we had] young girls coming up to the place where we were playing (3) thought we were pretty special (2) it rubs off on you eventually ...(4) it's kind of weird (2) but (4) yeah (3) yeah (8) even though it was always a mutual kind of (2) act (2) I certainly took advantage of the situation I was in (5) ...but I certainly didn't treat them with respect (L372)

There is a great deal of difference between Neil the 20 year old 'rock star', and Neil the responsible family man of today. There is the sense in the preceding excerpt that he is ashamed of the rock star persona that he took in those days. Ironically he describes his focus over the last 10 years as being 'nice to people', helping where he can and being generous.

A significant area of shame, and one not identified by Neil as such, is in relation to his wife. When she is angry with him, it is often over something he has forgotten or not done properly. She discloses her vexations by saying something like 'I told you to do that and you haven't'. He discloses often feeling inadequate and put down as a result. He also says he feels belittled and helpless at the time. It is not an isolated circumstance; rather it is a discernable pattern that has gained momentum over the last 10 years.

Even though, as an adult, Neil is aware of what is behind the comments, he still feels the effect.

I: what are those little comments ...designed to do?

P: (3) they're designed to hurt me [inaudible] just little things, she doesn't really think about it (2) just real small little things

I: ...how do they make you feel?

P: ...useless (2) useless you know (4)... there's only so long you can sort of put up with it (2) it eventually gets to you (3) (L275)

Also noted above is the reported use of 'silent treatment'. One instant of rebuff described by Neil is when he tries to get close to his wife and she turns him away. He describes the ensuing feeling as one of rejection, as if he had done something wrong. In

fact after Neil recognized the pattern, he took it as a cue that he had done something wrong, and would immediately seek to rectify it. The balance of power is reflected in a remark made in a back-up phone call. Whether it is about work, house, or family, Neil's motto is 'if she's happy, then I'm happy'.

The only other reference to shame is that Neil sometimes feels ashamed of his race. He refers to the atrocities committed against the Jews in the Second World War, the subjugation of indigenous peoples throughout the world. More locally he reports feeling ashamed of the treatment of Maori by Pakeha (New Zealanders of European descent), and is disgusted by negative attitudes towards Maori culture by many New Zealanders.

Shame and Anger

Neil has reported shame and anger in his early childhood. However this is seen in the context of sibling rivalry and conflict. He would 'wind' his sister up, and she would 'wind' him up. The anger involved was in reaction to provocation and passed quickly. His episode of shame occurred as the result of a rather cruel utterance, which had been provoked by anger. So he felt angry, said something to upset his sister, and felt shame over what he had said. He recalls feeling guilty and ashamed over what he'd said, and recalls that he never said it again.

The next reported instant of shame is in relation to a brief period when he was 20 and took on the identity of a 'rock star'. There is little doubt that at the time, Neil was living his dream, and was not ashamed of his behavior. However, it appears that when looking back on these times, there is an element of retrospective or delayed shame. In Neil's case, because he did nothing which violated moral or deeply held norms, the shame takes on a superficial quality, and is associated with statements such as 'did I really do that' or 'did I seriously think that'. In this sense it is more akin to embarrassment.

In Nathanson's (1992) formulation of shame, Neil was acting from an *avoidance script*. By taking on the rock star identity he was possibly masking an aspect of himself of which he was ashamed. It is possible to simply be ashamed of one's own ordinariness, or the ordinariness of one's life. It makes sense in this context, that Neil was creating a persona that said to the world, look at me, I'm special I'm good. He describes receiving

this message from the 'girls' who used to hang around the band, yet he treated them without respect. They were not drawn to Neil the person, rather they were drawn to the mask, and it is possible Neil felt disgusted with this situation, and ashamed of his own involvement.

Implicit within the text is the notion that simply wearing the mask is shaming in and of itself. Neil comments that he left that world and went travelling because he felt he wasn't being his true self. He also describes himself at this time as 'arrogant and self centered', and generally being carried away by the attention given to him by fans. There is the sense that he didn't like his rock star self.

Leaving to discover his true self may also be seen as part of an avoidance script. If a person feels the need to travel in order to complete or make him or herself more whole, then a sense of inadequacy or insecurity about the self is likely. Needless to say, a sense of inadequacy is a source of shame, which can be modulated by moving away from eyes that threaten to expose a vulnerable self. It is easy to imagine young people experimenting and bolstering their true sense of self far away from those who have long since categorized them wrongly.

Several years after returning, Neil met his wife and began a family. He had apparently transformed himself from a womanizing musician 'type' into a responsible, hard working family man. A brief examination of the text shows a strong similarity in values between the new Neil and how he describes his father. The question may be asked – to what extent does Neil try to live up to his father's standards? Connected with this question is – to what extent does Neil feel shame when he can't live up to his father's standards?

Within Nathanson's (1992) model, we are always moving towards a self that is based on pride, to be someone we are proud of. Neil is the inexhaustible provider for his family. His need for 'harmony' and 'smoothness' requires that he do more; whatever is necessary to maintain this state. His immediate aim then is to keep his wife happy because he sees her as the disruptor of peace in their household.

When his wife makes her diminishing comments and gestures, Neil feels reduced. He states that he feels 'useless', and that he can't do anything right. His wife goes silent and he says 'what have I done wrong'? He recalls trying to negotiate and reason. The cycle

of a typical conflict between Neil and his wife may be seen as a succession of shame modulating scripts. First comes shame that accompanies rejection and rebuff. He reacts from an *attack self script*, where in he functions at a lower level of esteem in order to maintain the bond. His wife withdraws emotionally further exaggerating Neil's sense of rejection and helplessness. After 3-4 days he is becoming angry, and operates from an *attack other script*. Then his wife leaves.

Neil says that often the trigger point for an angry outburst by him is rejection by his wife. He describes already being primed for anger because of a build up of anger that he has tried to contain. He becomes exhausted of, and quietly angry about, his wife's put-downs. Then he snaps and 'things get out of control'. In this formulation, which is based on Neil's account of events, rejection (shaming) occurs first, followed by anger.

Neil describes these situations as 'regular' and the pattern as 'disturbing'. With the increased regularity of these incidents has come a decrease in his ability to modulate his anger. This said, there is no hint that Neil has done something in a rage that he is ashamed of. He is not ashamed of the way in which he has dealt with these heated situations. In fact there is the sense that the expression of anger in these situations feels good and is consistent with internal feelings without being overtly violent.

Similarly about his breaking of another driver's glasses, Neil says he feels no shame. His reasoning is that it was a provoked act of aggression, and that it was controlled, and the damage to the other actor was indirect and superficial. He felt he reacted appropriately under the circumstances. If anything not to act may have brought Neil a sense of shame because passivity is linked to a sense of helplessness. In the above scenario, Neil was getting bullied and he stood up and said 'I won't take it'. Therefore he experienced a sense of pride. This is consistent with an *attack other script*.

When Neil was attacked and hit on the head with a bottle, he recalls that he felt he had been defeated. This triggered the affect shame, and his impulse for revenge called into play an *attack other script*. Not feeling comfortable with the possible confrontation, he made the switch to an avoidance script. This mode of operating involved for Neil a disavowal of his shame through reasoning, for example, that he was out numbered. It also involved minimizing the effect the attack had on him, and by shifting responsibility for the

attack away from the personal by saying it was racially inspired. All of these strategies functioned to reduce and modulate Neil's sense of shame.

In summary, Neil describes shame as resulting from a transgression. In this context he describes himself as relatively shame free. With anger he has never experienced it as a long-term feeling. Looking at isolated instances of shame it appears that they are associated with anger in one of two ways.

The first involves a shame /rage/shame cycle, and occurs when Neil was provoked (through shaming by others) into an angry state, in which he overstepped an internally defined boundary, and acted in a way that resulted in him feeling shame.

The second is of a more serious nature, and involves his perception that his wife deliberately shames him for her own benefit. That is, he is on the receiving end of an attack other *script*. He feels justified in his expression of anger, and to date has not overstepped internally set boundaries. Therefore he has not acted in a way that has caused him to feel shame as the result of anger in this particular situation.

Shame is also identified that is indirectly associated with anger at the self. It comes from acting in a way that is harmful to others, but that falls within the boundaries of socially sanctioned conventions. That is, Neil 'the rock star' used women for sex and disregarded them. He is mildly ashamed and slightly angry at himself for acting in this way.

Case Study # 12: Neville

Neville is 45-year-old male of taller than average height and medium build. He left school at 16, having obtained school certificate. He trained as an apprentice electrician and has worked in that field since. He is currently self-employed on a casual basis. He is recently separated from his partner of 20 years. They had no children together, and she has 1 adult child. Neville has a history of alcohol abuse and has no history of violence or criminality.

Neville seemed to be nervous about the interview, although it was later learnt that much of his manifest tension was to do with a current relationship separation. He was friendly and very willing to talk about personal issues. His answers to questions seemed generally focused, although there was a tendency to change subject when talking about shame. Answers were not unduly short or long. For 100 questions, there were 585 lines of participant text (av. 5.85 lines/question). There were 30 lines of text in which shame was addressed specifically and by name.

Emotionally, Neville came across as positive, and in spite of upheaval in his life, reported that he felt the best he'd felt in a long time. During the interview his mood was stable, and he seemed detached from the emotions reported in his narrative. However, long pauses were noticeable when talking about difficult subjects especially in relation to his personal shame. Also, his speech was noticeably slower in these sections.

Anger

Neville was born in the late 1950's into a lower middle class family. His parents were overtly religious, and his upbringing took place within the context of church and religious observance. His parents are still married. Neville remembers his family environment as 'caring', loving, and close knit. This applied not only to his immediate family, but to his large extended family as well. His mother is described as warm, totally immersed in the church, and naïve about the world outside the church community. His father on the other hand is characterized as 'a man of the world'.

Neville's father was a door-to-door salesman, who began his career selling clothes, then electroluxes, then insurance and finally Rawleighs. He is described as a true Christian who was not 'money driven', and as someone who 'loved to help others'. He was kind and was neither angry nor aggressive. Neville adds that he was non-controlling towards the mother and children.

Members of the family related to each other with respect, and there was a strong culture of respecting one's elders. Neville does not recall any 'unpleasantness' or anger between members, except for his older brother. He was reportedly angry towards his parents and left home at 16 in pursuit of a non-Christian lifestyle that centered on 'surfing', partying and other rebellious activities.

As a child Neville was very shy and found it difficult to make friends with children outside the church community. He had several friends within it. He does not remember himself as an angry child. In fact he does not remember an instance of anger in his childhood.

While growing up, Neville stayed very close socially to his family and the church community. He didn't get into trouble in or out of school, and kept up with his schoolwork. By 14-15, he began to experiment with marijuana on a very minor scale. At this stage he had begun to move away from the church influence as well. By 16 years old he had grown his hair long and refused to cut it. But Neville didn't have access to what he calls 'normal social life', because he was bounded by strict rules that prohibited him from staying out late, going to parties, or other social gatherings outside the church. He reports that most of his rebellion occurred behind his parent's back, and that he wasn't rebelling against them as such. He still enjoyed close ties with the family.

Neville describes adolescence and young-adulthood as fairly quiet and unproblematic. After he left school he ceased to be involved with the church, more because life simply took him in a different direction than anything else. He had steady employment and enjoyed his job. He had a limited, but close group of friends, and enjoyed creative hobbies, such as photography and woodcraft. He does not recall being overtly angry at this stage of his life.

At around 23-24 years old he met his future partner of 20 years. She had a daughter from a previous relationship. Neville's biggest dream was to have a home and a family,

and this new situation seemed to him to fit this dream. Neville came into this situation with a very clear set of expectations about what a family was and how it should be. For example, mutual respect was important. He also expected that everyone, including children, would do their share of household duties.

I know that my family make people welcome, and I know that she would feel comfortable after a few times. She didn't feel comfortable the first time and said I don't want to go any more and never did and (2) um never became part of that family unit, which um my family goes through to uncles and aunties and cousins, (2) it's that sort of family (L19)

Another aspect of family life which proved problematic for Neville, was his daughter's contribution to general household duties

I understand a family working is the family I came from, (2) where (3) you work together, where you have to make the house a home you know, (2) even if it's just bringin [sic] in a bit of kindling (2) you've got to do a little bit (2) and [stepdaughter] was never made to do anything. (2) She never had to do a thing at all (2) and that was a big (2) thing, which I could see as a real (2) problem coming up you know (L275)

His 'stepdaughter's' rejection of his family was 'niggly' for Neville, yet it was a situation he tried to accommodate. Even so, he describes feeling frustrated and often angry at it. Neville's ideal of cohesion and unity within the family was instead evolving into one of fragmentation and friction.

Neville felt he was being blocked or prevented from participating in his stepdaughter's upbringing. Because of this, his relationship to his partner also came under strain. Neville reports that she (partner) rejected any input or influence he tried to exert over her daughter. Boundaries were clearly marked and because of this, Neville felt powerless and alienated. He began to develop a sense of resentment towards both his partner and her daughter.

The sharing of power became a problem in other areas of his relationship with his partner. The pattern wherein Neville's ideas were rejected outright, spread to all aspects of

their relationship. Neville reports, that his ideas and suggestions about anything from ‘where to put the couch’, to where to plant a plant were discarded without question.

All of the above circumstances contributed to a steady build-up of anger and resentment in Neville. He was unable to engage with his partner in a constructive strategy in resolving these issues. This, he reports, is because he is in general unable to cope with conflict of any sort and as a rule he backs down and removes himself from the situation. The following is illustrative:

yeah I wanted harmony and I wouldn't try and rock the boat and I would just go along with things that she would suggest [and]... when I'd get angry (2) um I 'd just walk away (2) and (2) do things... elsewhere, rather than be involved or have the family involved (2) or [partner] and [stepdaughter] involved, I felt I wasn't accepted there (2) I'd just um make furniture or repair the lawn mower that sort of thing... I just don't want the confrontation is the common theme yeah (L1)

But 6 or 7 years into the relationship, Neville not only played with wood or kept busy after a conflict, he also began to drink. Not much at first, but he found it relieved the tension in him, and it soon became part of his coping strategy.

As the extent of the problems with his wife became apparent, so too did Neville's awareness that he was more and more unable to cope. So as time went on his drinking became heavier. But his frustration was not just directed at his partner and ‘stepdaughter’, it was also directed at himself. Although Neville blamed his wife for limiting his input into the aspects of family life already mentioned, he was also frustrated with his own inability to assert himself and his ideas.

After 9-10 years of marriage, Neville was resentful and unhappy both with himself and his relationship. He and his partner were unable to work things out, and Neville decided he needed to leave in order to arrest the destructive spiral he was on.

After a break lasting several years, another attempt at the relationship was made. However the same patterns reemerged, and Neville tried to cope with his feelings by drinking. He came to the point where he admitted to having a ‘drink problem’. He recalls, that from that point on, his drinking ‘skyrocketed’. Whether he drank in secret or socially, the result was the same; he would become abusive towards his partner. Often he would not

remember his outbursts, because he was so drunk. The next day, she would confront him, and he would escape from the confrontation – and start drinking again. And so the cycle went.

After many failed attempts at reconciliation, Neville decided to quit the relationship indefinitely. It seems, that he was unable to reduce the negative emotion he had towards his wife while they were together.

He has given up drinking and has done considerable self-development through AA and other groups. He says, that he can get angrier now than he ever could; yet through training, he is able to identify and cope with his negative emotions in a manner satisfactory to himself.

Shame

Neville was unable to define shame formally. Like other participants, his understanding of shame emerged over the course of the interview. After gathering together these various threads, it appears that Neville associates shame with his own unworthiness, especially of other people's respect and acknowledgement. When asked to describe the feeling of shame, he says it is a feeling that 'overpowers' him to the point that he cannot function. He describes it in terms of being disorganized and that it causes him to 'go round in circles'.

We have seen that in general, Neville has positive memories of his childhood experience. His home environment is described as loving, and he felt cared for and respected within the family and also the church community. Apart from school, most of his time was spent within the family and church milieu, and it was there that he derived a sense of security and acceptance.

But Neville reports difficulties when it came to the world outside the church and family. He recalls having difficulty socializing with other children at school, for example. The difficulty was that he could never simply be part of the group, that somehow he lacked something. He did not know what, which made interaction with other non-religious kids difficult. From the present perspective, Neville describes himself as being 'socially incompetent' as a child. Importantly, Neville says that he could never pinpoint the exact

cause of this difficulty, and so he could never overcome it. It was vague and abstract, but it did affect him, as the following illustrates:

yeah I can remember even at primary school not really feeling 100% happy (3) ...for some reason you know. I couldn't ever really say this is the problem [but] I do remember that feeling [of being] unsatisfied (L528)

I suppose that a common thing would be social skills you know ...as I said before, feeling like I couldn't make friends, that sort of thing (L534)

I had a feeling of (8) [inaudible] there's some skill (2) or there's some part of me (2) which isn't good (2) um not that I'm not good at something yeah, it's some skill that I don't have in in (2) whether it's a sense of humor or um (3) a sense of home or (2) something like that, something that I can't put a finger on, but I don't feel a complete person (L538)

Neville recalls being teased as a child. In particular he remembers being harassed by a group of girls who lived close by:

...me next door neighbor, her and her friends just hassling me, cos I was (2) I was running away from them I suppose, I was taking the bait you know (2) and that was something that they took [advantage?] from ...at my expense (2) and I wouldn't say that I think of it often, but it's there yeah it's clear ... I ran into the boys toilets and hid (2) yeah the old run away and hide...yeah (2) I remember it happening not lots and lots of times, but I do remember it happening (L576)

As a result of these childhood experiences, Neville was unsure of himself in the social world. His self-esteem was affected, and he describes himself as being shy as a child. He says, that he thought he was being teased and taunted because of some fault with him, that he was somehow 'bad'. Yet, he also remembers desperately wanting to be accepted by 'everyone' and that the thought of them seeing a fault in him, which he could not see, was unbearable to him.

Neville's difficult relationship with the world outside the church and family continued into his teens. He describes himself as a 'shy' teenager, who felt 'inadequate' in

social life. Although he did have some friends at school, Neville reports feeling stifled and limited in his ability to meet new people. He reports that the people he wanted to make friends with seemed inaccessible to him. He describes a sense of shame about his own inability to mix freely and to break down his own barriers of social inhibition:

there was shame (2) um (3) ...um (8) yeah [p is having difficulty here] I felt I (2) couldn't talk to people or couldn't converse (2) um um for what reason I don't know... yeah I was frustrated with myself... I couldn't see why I couldn't be accepted by those people um (2) I didn't see that I did anything wrong (2) um, and it's something that I still feel today um...[it's] a feeling inside myself, that I couldn't (2) I couldn't break into that social group, which I would like to (2) that's how I felt (L230)

Neville felt frustrated with himself. At no point does he express anger towards those he couldn't make friends with. Rejection does not appear to be guiding his emotional reaction to this situation. He takes responsibility for the lack of satisfying social interaction in his life. This is a theme that recurs within his adult relationships as well. The period of time from leaving school to around 24 is covered in the anger section above, and there is nothing to add from a shame perspective.

It seems clear, that when Neville met his partner, he had expectations concerning a home and family. Those expectations were apparently based on his experience within his family of origin. He expected respect from his 'stepdaughter', as well as from his partner. He also expected the family to function in a certain way, for example, that his stepdaughter would contribute to the upkeep of the home and that she was obliged, good reasons notwithstanding, to interact with his own family. He also expected to be supported in these expectations by his partner.

From Neville's perspective none of the above expectations were realized. He understood this to mean that his views and expectations were not important and that his wishes were of little consequence. As mentioned above, it was not simply in relation to an isolated event that he felt sidelined; it was according to Neville a general pattern over time and place. To be discarded or shut down in this way is shaming. Neville reports, that he felt unacknowledged and not respected by both his partner and his stepdaughter. Although

he did not specifically mention shame in this context, it is assumed here, that the above adjectives are expressions of shame.

Shame is talked about in relation to Neville's inability to change the situation, to exert his wishes and desires onto the situation. In the following excerpt, Neville talks briefly about feeling ashamed of his weakness:

umm (3) I know that (2) um (2) I had a lot of (2) shame in [about] my weaknesses ...I find it very hard, because I didn't recognize how I felt (2) I realize now, today, how unaware of my feelings I was um, and (2) I don't remember being angry that often, but I do remember shame (L513)... that made me feel quite weak, in that I would not assert myself (2) I did/ I did always feel weak in that way (L481)

To round off this section, it is necessary to talk about the relationship between shame and Neville's drinking. Drinking, it appears, was more a means of modulating shame than anger in that he would drink in response to his inability to confront and assert himself with his partner. For example, he would suggest something, she would dismiss his suggestion, he would feel dismissed, but would not respond in a way he felt he ought to.

To cope with his weakness, he would remove himself to 'the garage' and drink. While under the influence of alcohol, he became abusive and angry towards his partner. Even though Neville did not always feel shame for his outbursts, the very fact that he was only able to 'assert' himself when he was drunk was a potent reminder of his weakness and so perpetuated shame and the feelings of unworthiness that is part of it.

Finally there is one more excerpt about shame, alcohol and anger which is worth mentioning. Neville and his partner sought relationship counselling. It was after Neville had admitted he had a 'drinking problem'. He reports that the counsellor rapidly put their relational problems down to his drinking – '...it was my fault'. Even though this was a potentially shaming situation for Neville, he reports feeling nothing but anger. His indignation is evident at the time of the interview. He felt no shame, because he did not believe it was true. He felt angry because he felt the responsibility for *their* relational problems was being forced onto him by someone who he had known for less than an hour. Again he responded by drinking.

Shame and Anger

Neville is not aware of himself as being angry during his childhood. He is aware though of feelings, which are closely associated with shame. These feelings seem to center around two distinct but related levels of self-consciousness. One is his inability to relate to others on an equal level. He simply could not make meaningful contact in a way that was satisfying to him, and he did not know why.

The second is that he felt powerless to change this situation. He could not change it, because he says, he could never pin point what the problem was. The impression gained is that although he was not ashamed of himself as such, his esteem and sense of security was undermined. This only seems to apply outside the family and church - for example at school. He developed an abstract sense of himself as being somehow not acceptable to other children. Other children reinforced this through their teasing of Neville.

It is probable that Neville was experiencing shame, albeit of a diffuse nature. It appears that he coped with these feelings through a *withdrawal script*. He describes himself as a shy child, whose reaction was to keep a low profile and proceed with caution. This mechanism no doubt directed him to avoid situations, in which he perceived there was a risk of rejection/humiliation. He remained on the periphery and hoped that his need for social acceptance would be satisfied.

Although he may have avoided initiating new social contact, Neville still wanted it. In this sense, he did not avoid something that was aversive, rather, he simply feared to approach that which he wanted. This fear, which is very likely associated with rejection, would establish itself as a trait and as such would endure in Neville as part of his self, until the present.

With an increase in age, self-consciousness, and the resulting complexity and sophistication by which we know ourselves, Neville had by his teens come to know this trait as 'weakness'. He describes himself as 'not having the guts' to make contact with desired peers. He describes himself in terms akin to being left on the outside, tongue tied and unable to effect a change in his relationship to others. Now he reasons that it was a cultural difference between the culture of the church (Neville) and secular culture (other children) that was the problem. But he admits this is a recent formulation. Previously he

had thought it was an unidentifiable fault with him somewhere in the vicinity of 'I am bad'.

By the time he was 15-16, Neville had realized there was a church world and there was 'the other world'. Like his elder brother, he desired the other teenage world. He drifted away from the church, but not he says with anger. He describes it as a quiet 'behind the scenes' rebellion. All the while he stayed close to his family, abiding by the rules and remaining respectful of his parents' wishes.

The picture so far is of the emergence of a shame-based view of the self. The focus for Neville is on the difference between how he sees himself and how he sees others seeing him. He imagined others seeing him as deficient, and the more they didn't accept him, the more he came to accept that he was deficient. The more deficient he saw himself, the greater the shame and the greater the pain. He coped with these painful feelings primarily by withdrawal.

The methods were the same as when he was a child, except that he was more self-conscious as a teen. He was still shy and retiring and had great anxiety over the taking of social risks. But withdrawal is a shame trap in itself, because in Neville's case at least, it served to amplify his distance from his desired goal: acceptance by others. He addressed this issue through an avoidance script.

Through self-examination, Neville had tried to arrive at why he was unacceptable to his peers. He attempted to foster in himself what he imagined he lacked. He attempted to endear himself through humor. He also tried the drugs of the day and grew his hair long in order to blend and ultimately to be accepted by a wider social group. In this sense, he tried to change himself to fit the environment. However what was lacking in Neville appeared to him to set in concrete, and his hopes and efforts failed to change him sufficiently to become the socially accepted person he wanted to be.

If there was anger about this situation, it was at himself, because ultimately he blamed himself for his social demise. However, he does not talk of himself as angry at this stage.

After leaving school Neville did an apprenticeship as an electrician. Work and the gaining of expertise in a particular field may be seen as shame modulating in itself. Neville was good at his job and had no problems socializing within the work milieu. He did

continue to have difficulties socializing in general, but because the structure of life at school (where one has no choice whether to be there) was different from the adult world (where there are more freedoms and choices), issues of social acceptance were probably diluted. Very little else is discernable about the period from 17-24 years of age.

Neville identifies both shame and anger in relation to his partner. Within the family context (new family), he, very early on, found himself in a position of impotency and helplessness. Both mother and daughter dismissed his aspiration that his 'stepdaughter' integrate into his greater family. This is shaming in several ways, including, being embarrassed before his family, feeling powerless to change the situation and feeling disrespected by his 'stepdaughter' and partner. This list is not exhaustive.

There was no formal arrangement or rule that Neville had no input into his stepdaughter's upbringing. Therefore he kept urging, suggesting and generally trying to be part of the decision making process. But the net result was that he had no influence. He felt marginalized and never fully integrated into the family process. The situation was inherently shaming for Neville.

Characteristic scripts of withdrawal and avoidance were invoked. He coped initially by removing himself from the situation, thereby reducing the risk of further shaming. He emerged himself in work and creative activities meant to divert shame related self-consciousness into more pride restoring activities. Within the avoidance strategy, this kind of behavior may be seen as part of a denial mechanism, the goal of which is to convince oneself that either there is no problem, or that it is unimportant.

But Neville's intensity of feeling about not being acknowledged and respected increased over the years. Whereas formally he reports that he wasn't aware of being angry when he adjourned to 'the shed', maybe a bit frustrated, he was after the first 3-4 years beginning to experience noticeable anger. Neville reports that the anger was both directed at his partner as well as at himself.

Obviously he felt his partner was being unfair and maybe autocratic. But her treatment of him was deeply shaming for Neville. Should one feel constantly damaged and dismissed by one's partner? Obviously this is not a formula for a healthy relationship. Neville felt bad, and he saw that it was his partner who was causing him to feel this way.

Before her he felt weak and helpless, and lacked the confidence to assert himself. In his mind, Neville asked ‘with whom does the problem lie?’

As well as his partner, Neville was aware that he had his part. He was of the mindset that if he was stronger and stood up for himself, ‘she’ could not make him feel so incompetent. In this respect his sense of shame was of his own doing, and it was only by changing his weakness into strength that he could restore his pride. But he couldn’t, and as a result was often frustrated with himself. Because his weakness had caused him to be exposed to such shame (e.g., if he wasn’t so weak his wife couldn’t continually shame him), he was angry that he was weak, and frustrated he could not turn it into strength. The net effect is anger at the self as the result of feeling ashamed of oneself.

To allay shame feelings Neville began drinking. Alcohol abuse is part of an *avoidance script*. The more helpless he felt, the more frustrated he became, and the more he drank. It helped Neville forget his weakness, it disinhibited him, and he was able to (in his mind at least), briefly live the fantasy of being strong and standing up to his partner. The reality was that he became abusive towards her, which no doubt evoked the affects disgust and fear in her. Neville’s abuse was part of an *attack other script* designed to reduce the esteem of another, to shame them for the purpose of elevating one’s own self-esteem.

Nothing was achieved from this, except a negative cycle of shame and abuse. There is nothing to suggest that Neville felt ashamed of the content of what he said. He does say though that he is ashamed of the way his ‘bad self’ had taken over and his powerlessness to present himself as the ‘good Neville.

Over the last 10 years Neville has regained enough control of his life to be able to say ‘I feel good about myself now’. He undertook rehabilitation for alcohol abuse, and he has consequently completed 4-5 separate treatment programs. Through these, he has come to view alcoholism as a disease, and his own weakness as an aspect of himself, which can be modified. This he admits is a long process.

Case study # 13: Nathan

Nathan is a 43-year-old male of average height and build. He left school at 15 without formal qualification. He trained as a 'tire builder', and worked as such until the age of 33. Since that time he has been semi-retired. He used drugs and alcohol socially until his early 30's, at which time he stopped using drugs and has the 'occasional' beer. He has no history of addiction, violence or criminality.

Like many of the other non-angry participants, Nathan appeared to approach the interview in a nonchalant and casual manner. He gave the impression of being shy and retiring: someone who likes to mind his own business. His communication style was non-aggressive and non-combative. Nathan was apprehensive about self-disclosure, and this was evidenced by short, unelaborated answers to many of the personal questions. Related to this, he tended to be euphemistic and minimalist in his answers. For 382 lines of participant text, 121 questions were asked yielding the lowest average of 3.1 lines/question. 27 lines were directly related to shame.

Emotionally, Nathan came across as a combination of melancholic, empathetic, and content. With a few exceptions his mood was relatively stable throughout the interview. The exceptions were: he became serious and his speech noticeably impaired when talking about his marriage split; he became highly emotional (sad, distressed) when talking about losing a custody battle for his son.

Anger

Nathan was born in the late 1950's, the eldest of 4 children, into a working class family. His father was a labourer in a local factory and his mother fulfilled the traditional role of mother and homemaker. Nathan's family was structured along patriarchal lines, wherein his father had a position of unquestioned authority and his mother was in charge of domestic organization.

Nathan describes his father as a 'good dad' who valued 'honesty' and a hard day's work. He is also described him as a 'workaholic', yet in Nathan's view he managed to

balance long hours of work with family commitments, including those that were important for the bond between father and son.

yeah a workaholic yeah he was a workaholic yeah (2) sort of ahh (2) yeah like he'd be there for rugby (2) for sport yeah if you were playing rugby on the weekend yeah he'd come to that, he'd like I remember that sort of thing like he'd knock off work and come and watch ya play rugby and (2) go back to work again afterwards ...yeah he was working hard trying to make ends meet I suppose (2) back in those days (L32)

Nathan remembers his father as strict, requiring that things be done his way. Discipline was important within Nathan's family, and in his younger years (until 8-10 years old) it involved physical punishment by his father. There was a strap for serious transgressions, which was rarely used. Generally a 'smack or clout around the ear' was dealt out, and Nathan remembers this in relation to failing to do chores and carry out set tasks.

From around 10-15 years old, punishment involved being grounded, no TV for a specified time, and being banned from using the telephone. Of punishment in general, Nathan remembers it as fair, not harsh, and not traumatic.

Of his childhood years, Nathan remembers the atmosphere of the household as 'busy' but not tense. His parents were of stable and positive disposition, and their relationship is reported to have been harmonious. He does not remember them arguing. If there were conflicts between them, they resolved it away from the children.

Anger was not a major or even memorable affect for Nathan during his childhood. He describes his childhood as 'pretty smooth', without any significant ups and downs, and apart from the odd spat with siblings he can't recall that he was ever really angry. He regards himself both as a child and adult, as being easy going.

By his early teens (12-15 years), Nathan appears to have developed a strong identity and sense of himself. He was beginning to test boundaries, both inside and outside the home. A heightened capacity for moral judgment in combination with a positive sense of self meant that Nathan was able to deal with perceived injustice with a great deal of conviction. The following is illustrative:

ohh I'd probably be 13 (2) 12 or 13 yeah ...yeah it was high school so it was 13... the teacher was going to cane me... I think it [was for] not doing my homework... yeah I just [said] no you're not going to do that and I'm not going to bend over for you... you can't make me do that [and] I'm not going to do it ...[so] I just ended up in the headmaster's office... [and so I told the head master that] no I don't accept it for not doing my homework ... no one's going to hit me and that's it and ...Mum ended up coming down to school and [I] got a talking to and that was it yeah (2) I didn't get the cane ...I just didn't accept it [the cane] yeah (L176)

In this as well as other incidents, Nathan's mother stood behind him, thereby serving to validate his judgment and sense of security. Central to the above issue is a perceived sense of injustice and the appropriateness of Nathan's reaction to it. His sense of justice also led him into violent situations at school. He recalls that in most of the fights in which he was involved at high school, he was trying to stop them, or was defending against bullying. He was never the bully, nor did he look for fights or conflict in general.

While Nathan enjoyed a good relationship with his parents during his teenage years, he admits to becoming increasingly disgruntled with aspects of the relationship. He had always accepted his father's authority without question, but by 15 he required more freedom than was allowed within the family unit. For example, his parents actively monitored his whereabouts at night and on weekends, wanting to know where he was and whom he was with. This became frustrating for Nathan as he became older:

...that might be why I left home and went out flatting to get you know so I could do the things I wanted to do (2) rather than having to ask all the time so I could do this and do that (2) I'd rather make my own mind up and think yip tonight I'm going to go and do this (2) without having to ask (L94)

Nathan was also reliant on his parents for money, and describes frustration with this situation:

around the 15 mark you know (2) money became important sort of thing ...to me (2) sort of earning money to be able to do things instead of having to put my hand out all the time to mum and dad (L66)

From the age of 15 to 32, Nathan worked in the same factory as his father. Like his father, he gave working and saving money high priority. Consequently he spent his entire working life working the most unsociable yet most lucrative shifts at the factory.

In his early 20's he married and had a son. This phase of his life is described as routine and revolving exclusively around the family. He describes his relationship with his wife as harmonious and largely without conflict. There was no violence, and angry exchanges were rare. He still worked long hours, and both were single minded in their commitment to the plan of working hard now so they could retire early.

As an adult, Nathan describes himself as 'easy going' and 'laid back'. He tended not to dwell on problems, and if there was one, his reaction was to 'fix it' and get on. His impression of himself is of a man who is not easily angered, and when he is, he doesn't stay angry for long. He tends to seek solutions straight away. This 'fix it quick' philosophy was inherited from his father, and permeated all aspects of life including relational problems.

Anger became a more significant part of Nathan's life when he discovered his wife was having an affair, and that she wanted a divorce. He learned of his wife's affair first through a 'tip-off', and it was confirmed when he walked in on her and her lover unexpectedly. He was angry and there was an assault. He describes this anger as a combination of jealousy and betrayal.

This was obviously a time of mixed emotions for Nathan. He accepted in a short time that it was over with his wife, and characteristically focused his attention on 'getting [his] affairs in order', and looking to the well being of his son. Within one week he had negotiated a settlement with his wife and shifted out of 'their' house. He was deeply hurt for a long time afterwards, but he coped by getting himself away from the situation, and establishing a new home hundreds of miles away in an isolated part of the country. This, incidentally, had been his and his wife's plan anyway. By mutual consent Nathan also had custody of their son.

His next major episode of anger affect came 3 years later when he lost a bitter and acrimonious custody battle for his son. Even though 6 years have pasted since, Nathan still speaks of his anger at 'the system' with a bitter tone

the courts decided that I being a mere male (2) and the child's better off with his mother (2) they took him off me and gave him back to her ...so he [had been] living with me ...so come to think of it that was a time that I felt angry (2) at the system ...like I'd had him for 3 years and all of a sudden these people decided that he was better off livin with his mother (2) mainly for the sole fact that when couples broke up kids went with their mother and that's how it was ...10 years ago (4) yeah I was upset yeah (2) and there was nothing I could do about it (2) that was it (2) there was nothing else I could do yeah except for hand him over and say there you go and (2) I want to be there for the rest of his life so (2) I had to get access to him and all that ...(L302)

Nathan complied with the court ruling and in his rational mind reasoned that 'maybe' the court was right. Although he is deeply affected by the events mentioned above, Nathan focused his attention on the welfare of his son. This involved a broad approach from, not undermining his son's relationship to his mother, being there physically at every opportunity even though he lived 300kms away, and generally reassuring his son of his love and commitment to him.

At 14 years old Nathan's son chose (un-coerced) to live with him permanently. When talking about his son, Nathan is both animated and passionate for the first time during the interview. He describes his life now as being all he could ask for under the circumstances. He is semi- retired, spending much of his time hunting, fishing and generally subsistence living, and is a dedicated father.

Like many other participants, Nathan has a long list of institutions and groups of people that make him angry. These include racists, the taxman, inconsiderate people, and he is also angry that he doesn't feel safe walking through the streets of his hometown at night.

Shame

Nathan has a great deal of trouble defining shame. Like other participants, his definition develops over the course of the interview, rather than being given as a succinct and formal definition. This is because he 'has never thought about shame' as such. Through his own questioning it is apparent that Nathan associates shame with embarrassment, a less intense emotion and one which, at least according to Nathanson (1992), is a member of the shame family of affects.

Nathan talks of his childhood in positive terms. He reports receiving ample love and nurturing, and that he derived a strong sense of security from the family environment. He was never shamed, humiliated or put down by his parents. Through the way his parents related to him and his siblings, Nathan felt wanted and respected. Throughout his life he has had a healthy self-esteem and a strong sense of self.

When asked about behaviors or incidents that may have led to shame in his childhood, Nathan says that he is unable to recall any. He saw his behavior as a child as 'pretty normal really'. He was a bit naughty sometimes or broke rules here and there, but there are apparently no memorable instances of shame. The punishment he received was non-shaming, and was oriented towards learning and education. Nathan perceived it as fair, even though he did not appreciate it.

From a reasonably early age it appears that Nathan had evolved a system of codes and standards of behavior as part of his strong sense of self. This is likely a reflection of boundaries and standards set and adhered to within the family context. So as a teenager, when he refused the cane at school, he was applying his understanding of justice or fairness, and of what is a reasonable response to injustice. This faculty was obviously well developed in Nathan even as a 13 year old. It would be fair to say that his ability to protect himself from punishment (shaming) is evidence of confidence, and conversely, of a lack of self-deprecation or personal shame. In other words, Nathan saw himself as worthy of respect, and of fair and just treatment.

When asked about shame and his adult years, Nathan is also unable to recall acts or episodes where shame was significant. In other interviews, particularly those from the high anger group, the period from approximately 16 to 25 is associated with behavior which

transgressed self-held standards and codes, and therefore ultimately bought shame upon the individual. With Nathan this does not appear to be the case. He smoked some cannabis, got drunk occasionally, but says that his adult life mostly revolved around work. Even so, he reports having good friendships and relations with others.

As mentioned above, the violence he was involved in as a teen and as an adult, generally occurred in the context of protecting himself or another from an injustice, which includes sticking up for a vulnerable person. Not to assist when he felt it was needed would be to experience guilt and/or shame, because Nathan's code appears to require action in these circumstances

I'll stick up for myself and my friends (2) things like that ...I don't back down from [a fight] very quickly like I mean say [I was] out somewhere and someone came up to [my friend] and started assaulting them sort of style and I sat there and let that happen (2) I'd probably feel guilty for that I'd say (2) whereas if I jumped up and helped them or stopped it happening you know I'd do that, I just wouldn't sit there and let it happen (2) I couldn't do that (L242)

Nathan has consistently acted according to his standards, and according to the information provided, he has generally acted in a way that has brought him pride, or at least has left his conscience clear. For example, he has always worked and paid his own way, been honest, faithful and sincere in relationships, and has taken responsibility for the welfare and well being of his child. He has also achieved his dream of retiring early and living the life that he has chosen.

One might think that given the stated importance of work in his father's life, that Nathan may have a similar view. For example, Nathan states that his father derived a lot of his identity and self-pride from work. Evidently not to work was associated with shame for him. But 10 years ago Nathan stepped out of the work-based system. He admits that there is a tendency for people to regard his lifestyle with contempt, and that many have used the opportunity to try and shame him.

He says he accepts that some people will regard him with condemnation, but through a strong conviction that what he is doing is right for him, he is able to deflect criticism. This conviction ironically comes from seeing his father ruin his health through work to the

point that by the time he had retired, he was so physically impaired he was unable to pursue long anticipated activities, and died shortly after

I look at him (father) he worked 7 days a week um bloody 12 – 15 hours a day and I thought ...that's not going to be me, I'm not going to do that you know ...yeah he got to that age where he retired and he died (2) whereas I'm doing now what a lot of people do when they retire ...that's my outlook on that yeah, my philosophy I suppose you could call it I dunno yeah ...I'm happy doing what I'm doing and if other people don't like it well it's not my problem it's theirs you know (L438)

What about shame in relation to his marriage split? It appears that the humiliation of finding his wife with another man, and also the feeling of rejection at being discarded by his wife were there, but were quickly overridden by other concerns. This is very likely the shame that Nathan refers to as that which he was experiencing but was not aware of, or that which was drowned by other emotions at the time. What he does say of shame and his marriage split is that he felt the weight of others' (including parents and his child) eyes as he stood in front of a broken marriage. There was the sense that he had failed both his parents and his son. But after dispatching his wife and lover, Nathan recalls that his whole attention was focused on his son and his well-being. If shame was there, it was on a level below anger and hurt, therefore possibly represents an example of H. B. Lewis's bypassed shame.

Shame and Anger

Nathan remembers his childhood as free of both shame and anger. He describes it as a time of contentment and fun, mixed with a few family chores. When asked about the relationship between anger and shame, Nathan answers that there might well be one but that he isn't aware of it in his life.

As a teenager, Nathan says he wasn't angry, nor did he feel ashamed of himself for any behavior or for the way he was. His decision to leave school was made based on his desire to earn money, and gain his independence. Leaving school at 15 was a fairly normal option for non-academically inclined pupils 30 years ago, and stepping into a job (that was

organized by his father) with security, and which was extremely well paid, was seen as a golden opportunity. Nathan was proud that he was working, and of the control he had of his life. His parents were evidently in support of his decision to leave school.

Nathan's first reported encounter with anger and shame occurred in relation to his marriage split. He reports that until that point he had thought the marriage was sound and harmonious. The emotions he associates with this time are anger, distress, and disgust. He says he is not aware of feeling shame, yet this was a deeply shaming situation.

Using a shame analysis, it is argued here that it was the shame associated with humiliation and betrayal that preceded anger. The sequence of events that followed can be traced using Nathanson's compass of shame. Initially Nathan reacted from an *attack other script*, and assaulted the other male involved. The assault occurred as part of the ejection of the lover from Nathan's house. He did not physically assault his wife, although he verbally abused her.

Nathan's rapid acceptance of the split, and his business-like way of tidying up affairs may be seen as part of an *avoidance script*. By immersing himself in business matters, Nathan was able to avoid painful shame related feelings. The hurt that he felt was subsumed by a business-like attitude, which also protected him from exposing his feelings to the public. This attitude is associated with statements which abound in Nathan's conversation such as, 'that's it then', 'that's the way it is', 'there's no use crying over spilt milk', 'just get on with it', and 'don't think about it'.

The scripts just mentioned are both subordinate to a more general way Nathan appears to have coped. Moving away, isolating himself, is part of a *withdrawal script*, which appears to be thematic in Nathan's life. It was mentioned at the beginning that Nathan comes across as shy and retiring. He is by his own volition shy, and admits that he finds it extremely difficult to talk about himself on such a personal level. In fact, much of what was covered in the interview, Nathan says he has never talked about to anyone.

Within a week of discovering his wife's infidelity, Nathan had shifted onto a remote piece of land 300kms from his marital home. Over the last 10 years since the marriage split, Nathan has lived a reclusive and socially isolated lifestyle, venturing into town only if it is essential. This in combination with his shyness suggests a pattern of withdrawal.

Losing the custody battle for his son sent Nathan even further into reclusion. He reports that he had been proud to be able to care for his son, and under the circumstances felt it was the appropriate arrangement, and that he had done a good job. To lose custody after 3 years of caring for his son was inherently shaming for Nathan. It was shaming because he was reduced to a state of helplessness, and was prevented from reacting to perceived injustice. It must be remembered that Nathan derives a great deal of pride from standing up to injustice, yet here he was defeated in the eyes of his parents, his son, and his wife. Nathan's initial reaction was to diminish the esteem and integrity of those who he held responsible for his feelings of shame, namely, his wife and the courts. This is a strategy related to an *attack other script*.

Much of his anger was towards the court and the system that had imposed what Nathan perceived as an arbitrary decision on him. For him it was a deeply personal issue, but he saw the court process as impersonal and deeply flawed. To lose in this case was to lose face, to be stripped of one's dignity. 10 years later he still blames the system, and there is much bitterness in his voice when discussing this issue.

This pattern also involved reinterpreting events in an effort to reduce shame. He decided he was powerless to fight the decision. He decided that maybe the court was right, and his son should be with his mother. He also disavowed his pain by staying busy, and simply 'not thinking about it'. He simply put it out of his mind.

In his isolated environment, away from the world, Nathan need not face the myriad of situations that he reports make him angry in town or city. The kinds of situations and people that make him angry (see above) all have an element of shame about them. On a larger scale, his desire for autonomy and the need to be in control of his environment is not compromised in the country-side, as it is in the city. In his isolation, he is largely free from the authority and constraints of 'the tax man', of police or anyone else with whom contact may reduce his self-esteem and cause shame.

In summary, Nathan reports that he could not identify shame or anger for the period up until his late 20's. He was not shamed by his parents and has always had high self-esteem and a strong and positive sense of self.

The instance of high anger associated with his marriage split, was preceded by a shaming situation, i.e., finding his wife with her lover, and then being rejected by his wife.

His reaction to shame is consistent with Nathanson's model of shame avoidance and modulation.

The same can be said for the second episode of high anger in relation to losing custody of his son. In awarding custody to the mother, Nathan's credibility and efficacy as a caregiver was diminished. He was in effect publicly humiliated, which caused an angry reaction. As in his relationship breakup, Nathan was reduced to a position of powerlessness, with the major decision about his son's upbringing being taken out of his hands.

In both cases, Nathan initially reacted from an *attack other script*, a face saving script wherein the shamed person reduces the esteem and integrity of another in order to modulate that sense of shame. This was followed by an *avoidance script*, which involved disavowal of Nathan's shame through work, and the reinterpretation of events in order to reduce shame.

Nathan's most powerful script appears to be that of *withdrawal*. Rather than facing public humiliation and risking exposure of his sense of shame to others, he withdrew to a quiet isolated location, where he has remained for the last 10 years

CHAPTER THREE

Analysis

In the following section, the large amount of information from the individual case studies will be sorted into thematic sub-sections in order to identify core components of the individual's experiences of shame and anger, and the patterns of their relationships (Coffey & Atkinson 1996). The first issue to be dealt with is participant definitions of shame. This is done with the view to establishing not only participant understanding of the shame construct, but also a 'fit' between participant and theoretical understanding of the meaning of shame. The core issues here are validity and reliability (Hayes, 1997; Flick, 1998), which have been elaborated in a previous section.

Following this will be a discussion dealing with patterns of socialization, and examining contextual issues associated with shame and anger, or their absence. cursory analysis and comparison of case studies along with theoretical considerations (Thompson, 1989; Lazarus, 1991; and others) suggests that both shame and anger follow a development process based on maturation and socialization forces, and so it is hypothesized that the dynamic relationship between these two emotions will also change over time. Therefore this section is laid out against a loosely conceptualized developmental framework.

The final part of the analysis draws together the various ideas and patterns identified thus far, and overlays them with theoretically derived data taken from the case studies, and based on Nathanson's compass of shame.

Before proceeding it is thought expedient to define the concept of 'shaming', one of the key ideas of the following analysis.

Defining Shaming

Shaming is defined here along broad lines as any behavior that induces shame in another (Nathanson 1992). This may be done intentionally/unintentionally, with words, actions, emotions, attitudes, in concert, singularly, or in any other possible combination. Shaming may negatively affect self-esteem and other self-referencing constructs, or it may not. Whichever is the outcome, it can be said that shaming tests or puts pressure on one's self-concept. The following is a summary of how the individuals within the study group came to share the view of themselves as shame worthy.

Defining Shame

Study Group: At some point during the interview all participants were asked to define shame. All had a great deal of trouble in doing so, and none could give a formal definition. Instead, their understanding of shame was pieced together from fragments of dialogue spread throughout the interview. The most common spontaneous definition was that shame results from a transgression. Other categories identified were shame from being shamed by somebody else and family shame.

All participants regarded shame from transgression as the principal meaning of shame. That is, shame is the result of an act or behavior that falls below personally held standards. What is noteworthy for this group is that shame-eliciting situations always involved extreme acts such as, the sexual abuse of one's child (Anton), violence towards one's children (Arthur, Ashley).

Other participants felt shame for using and hurting people for their own pleasure. In this context shame appears to be linked to moral transgression. But when these shame narratives are analyzed further, it becomes evident that these episodes of shame are associated as much with failure, or being exposed as a failure, as they are with morality. In view of this, it is suggested here that shame for this group is weighted more towards achievement than morality (this finding is expanded on in the 'Family Origins of Shame' below). It is the shame, which is reflected in Nathanson's (1992) "Cognitive Phase of Shame" as "matters of personal size, strength, strength, ability, and skill" (p. 317).

When thinking about shame in general, participants made tacit reference to two broad categories of shame experience. There is actual felt shame, which involves an acute episode of shame affect, which is triggered by public exposure of a particularly damning behavioral transgression. This is the shame that participants most readily define as shame, and is that which Nathanson says 'most people' identify as shame per se – the feeling of shame. But there is a more diffuse *sense of* shame, which is difficult for participants to define because it is not necessarily linked to an act. It appears to be linked with one's negative evaluation of oneself over time and place.

The former is associated with the realization that one has committed a shameful act, and that this act has violated something of value to the instigator. It is accompanied by a physical and psychological shutting down of the system, and felt as pain from which there is no relief. A common theme is hurting one's children. Anton's shame for sexually abusing his daughter and Ashley's shame for intending to hit his son are two examples. Arthur's shame for physically abusing his daughter is another. Associated with 'acute shame' is the impulse to disappear, vanish, and in extreme cases (Arthur), to attempt suicide.

These inclinations are referred to by Nathanson as being part of the reactive phase of shame, and are commonly found in the literature as typical shame-induced behavior (see Gilbert & Andrews, 1998; Lewis, 1992; and others). In all of the cases examined, shame affect is preempted by the exposure, to *valued* others, of the knowledge that the act occurred. That is, shame affect was felt at the point of exposure to the world, and not at the time of the act. For example, Anton says he began to feel shame when he had to tell his wife of his act, not at the time of the act. This is also fully consistent with theoretical

definitions of shame, which posit an audience, or imagined audience as an antecedent to shame affect (Gilbert & Andrews, 1998).

The second domain of shame is more abstract in nature, and is consequently difficult to conceptualize and define. Rather than actual shame affect, participants alluded to a sense of shame that belonged to a period rather than an act. It is the shame of seeing oneself as one is seen, or imagined to be seen by others. It is the difference between saying 'I feel shame over that act' and 'I feel shame over how I was living/thinking/feeling during my 20's'. For example, 'I am ashamed of the me that the world was seeing', up until an unspecified point.

A case in point is Andrew's disclosure that his *modus operandi* for many years involved getting drunk or drugged, and violently abusing people who had done nothing to him. About this he reports feeling ashamed of the person who he was at that time, and of his thoughts and behavior. Ashley was ashamed of who he was as an alcoholic, and of the way he treated his wife. His life had become unintelligible to him, so utterly unbearable through alcohol, that he lost all respect for himself. Angus also came to see *himself* as pathetic, as the result of hitting 'rock bottom' through alcohol and drugs.

All participants in this group report being severely shamed as children. Interestingly, some participants alluded to this kind of shame as 'not theirs', as belonging to someone else. Participants identified a variety of ways in which they were shamed, the most common being, verbal put-downs, i.e., being told you are stupid, dumb, worthless, not good enough, etc., and physical abuse (i.e., beaten severely). The person doing the shaming was invariably a parent or guardian, and in some cases participants identified additional shaming by peers (children outside the family). Terms which participants used to describe themselves at this time included, having low self-esteem, pervading feelings of inferiority, inadequacy, worthlessness, unworthiness and uselessness. In some cases, participants saw these as synonyms for shame, and in others the connection was not made. Using shame in a broad and inclusive way, the above self-concepts fit in with Nathanson's (1992) and Miller's (1996) conceptualization of shame as a core component of many such self-diminishing states.

Shame in relation to the family involved aspects of the family about which the participant felt ashamed. In general it involved the witnessing of behavior that violated

fundamental relationship rules or rules of conduct by family members. It is more about what one sees, as opposed to what one has done or what one is doing that is shaming. The offending behavior is invariably associated with a negative family pattern and not an isolated incident. For example, Andrew associates family shame with the way his father abused his mother. He witnessed the physical, verbal, psychological abuse of his mother over a sustained period. Anthony witnessed his mother's licentious behavior – behavior that violated his expectations of the role of mother.

A theme that cuts across the variations of shame above is the issue of justification of behavior, especially violent behavior. All participants in the study group have histories involving violence, and some report violence against their partners. There is not one reference to feeling ashamed because of violence towards partners, and very few in relation to violence against other adults. Although this area was not examined in depth, it appears that, violence and shame are linked only when violence cannot be justified. If the violence was deemed justified by the participant, the resulting emotion is more likely to be linked to pride, but it is not shame. Noel broke a man's back, and reported no shame over this, because the violence occurred in protection of his sister. He felt justified. Participants tended to report violence (not violence against a spouse) in connection with retributive justice (upholding their moral rules) (e.g., Piaget, 1932), or as the natural reaction to being made a fool of (being shamed).

Control Group: Like members of the study group, non-angry participants had a great deal of trouble defining shame. Four out of six participants said shame was the result of a transgression or a certain kind of action. One participant (Neville) associated shame with his own weakness and being unworthy of respect by others, and Nathan thought shame was like embarrassment, but more intense. Overall, the control group referred to a broader range of shame eliciting situations than the anger group. For example, shame was associated with failing in one's goals, showing fear and being scared, hurting someone emotionally, as well as those situations already listed.

Several participants from this group reported instances of shame as the result of a transgression from childhood. For example, Neil reports feeling ashamed that he hurt his sister's feelings when he was 6 years old. It can be inferred from this that participants in

this group acknowledge the existence of a moral faculty early in life. That is, they can recognize from an early age that certain moral rules exist and that violation of these rules has an emotional consequence not only for the target, but also for the person who instigated suffering.

The majority of participants in this group link this faculty to socialization processes within the family e.g., Neil was taught to ‘do unto others, as you would have them do unto you’ by his parents from an early age. Norman was taught to respect other’s feelings, etc.. It was only in this group that shame was associated with social signals from another, such as crying (see Case study Neil), and seeing fear in another’s face (see Case Study Norman).

Family shame was only mentioned by Noel and not in reference to his family. Rather he was talking about a family he was aware of in his neighborhood. Although participants could grasp the concept of family shame, it generally fell outside the realm of their own experience, and so they found little (sometimes nothing) to say about it.

Family Context

The following section is concerned with contextual matters, primarily relating to the family environment in which participants were socialized. In order to understand the relationship or the variety of relationships between shame and anger, it is necessary to first examine the context within which socializing takes place, and to examine the dynamic patterns therein, which bear directly on the subject of this study.

First, parental status and structure will be considered, that is, who was there who was not. Then parents’ relationship quality will be examined in the context of the emotional climate within the family. Next, the relationship of each participant to respective parents/caregivers will be considered as an introduction into participant’s emotional attachments within the family. Following this is a section on the family context of shame where it will be shown that different family dynamics either give rise to, or do not give rise to, a shame-bound sense of self (Nathanson, 1992).

Parental Status

Study Group: There was significant variation in the structure of each family. Of seven participants, four report their parents were still together at 15 years old. The other 3 participants had parents who had split up by the time they were 6 years old. Albert and Ashley report their parents, as staying together until one parent died (in both cases it was the father who died). Anthony was, from the age of 6, raised by his uncle and aunty, while Arthur appears to have had various father figures in his life, including a 'collective father group' within the 'cult'. Anton was the only participant who lived in a step family situation.

Control Group: There was minimal variation between the structures of the families in this group. Of six control group participants, three (Neville, Noel, Neil) report that their parents are still together and married. Of the other three, Norman's parents were together until his father's death (Norman was 12 years old), and Nathan's parents were together until his father died recently. Nigel's parents divorced when he was 16 years old.

Relationship Quality - Parents

Study Group: In all but Albert's case, the male was seen as the dominating figure in the household. His mother dominated Albert's household. Relationships between parents are characterized as having high levels of coercion and aggression, as opposed to assertion (Dutton, 1998). All participants report hostile relationships between their parents or guardians. None report that their parents or guardians were caring or affectionate towards each other. Arthur, Anton and Andrew all report high levels of abuse between parents including physical violence, verbal and emotional abuse.

Control Group: Noel's mother appears to have been dominant in his family. She is portrayed as having a coercive and aggressive style of authority. Nigel reports that his father was dominant, and that he also had a coercive and aggressive style of exerting power

within the family. The 4 other participants report egalitarian relationships between parents, and that individual roles were based on a traditional model with the father as provider/disciplinarian, and mother as housewife/nurturer. These relationships are characterized as loving and caring, with high levels of mutual respect and support. They are reported as free from physical, verbal, psychological and emotional abuse. Nathan, Neville and Neil cannot remember their parents arguing.

Participants Relationship to Parents

Father

Study Group: Without exception, male guardians (fathers, stepfathers, etc.) were reported as being 'angry'. With the exception of Albert, participants reported their male guardians as either controlling and/or authoritarian, and that the use of physical violence, or threat of violence, towards them was the norm. There was significant variation as to the intensity and severity of this violence. It ranged from extreme in the cases of Anton, Anthony, and Arthur, to mild physical and/or threats of violence, as in the case of Angus. All participants reported high levels of fear in connection to their male guardians, whether they were violent or not.

There is also a strong theme of rejection of sons by their fathers. Relationships with the shaming parent are invariably reported as distant, not because the son chose it, but because the parent wanted it that way. There is a theme of participants wanting to be close to their fathers, but finding it was dangerous because of the ever-present danger of being shamed. When participants speak about their fathers, it is as much with hurt and sadness, as it is with anger. The type of anger referred to can be summed up in the statement, 'I am angry with you, because you caused incredible grief to others and me'. None report a loving or close relationship with their fathers/guardians. Anthony, Arthur and Anton had no contact with their biological fathers from the 4-7 year old period.

Control Group: In this group, only Nigel's father is characterized as an aggressive and 'angry type', although Nigel thinks of him as a 'good guy'. Nigel, reports his father to be 'short' and quick-tempered, and as largely absent in his childhood. Noel's father is remembered as quiet, harmless, an alcoholic, and submissive. Neil's father is characterized as a workaholic, as loving but not verbally or physically expressive of it. He was non-angry and non-aggressive. Norman recalls his father as gentle and caring, and expressive of love and affection. Neville's father was full of Christian kindness and helpfulness. He is remembered as non-angry and non-aggressive. Nathan recalls his father as fair and caring. He was a workaholic but managed to be there at important sports events. He was non-aggressive and non-angry.

Mother

Study Group: Overall there was significant variation in the way participants described their mothers. Both Albert and Arthur experienced their mothers as being extremely violent towards them, and along with Anton, report distant and unloving relationships to their mothers. These three, along with Andrew, report their mothers as having major depressive disorders, and also report them as having alcohol and/or drug addiction issues. Anthony's mother had abandoned him and he felt she did not love him. She is also reported as having alcohol related difficulties. His aunty (guardian) is described as supportive, and he enjoyed a close relationship with her. Ashley and Angus's mothers had a more 'traditional' housewife role in their families, and are seen by both as loving and supportive.

Control Group: Noel is the only member of this group who describes his mother as angry. She was responsible for discipline, which was often overly violent and unfair. Noel describes her as 'hot tempered'. Nathan, Neville, Norman, and Neil recall close and caring relationships with their mothers. They share an impression of them as totally dedicated to the family, and describe them in terms such as loving, caring, great, and a friend. They also say they felt their mothers respected them and that they wouldn't change anything about

them. Nigel recalls a traditional and caring mother, who was affectionate, but who was not there when he needed her.

Family Origins of Shame

Study Group: Shame is to do with the perception that others view us as shame worthy, as lower, unworthy or contemptible, and that we somehow share a similar view. To be viewed by the other in this way is shaming, but to view oneself in this way is to be ashamed of oneself.

All participants in this group described self-referencing feelings of shame from an early age. That is, when asked to think about how they felt about themselves as children, all participants in this group described having low self-esteem and feelings of worthlessness. The variety of adjectives used to describe themselves was broad and included feeling worthless, inadequate, that everyone else was better, unimportant, never good enough, unacknowledged, not validated. Without exception all self-referencing statements were shame related and negative.

When asked where they thought this negative self image came from, all participants referred to negative messages received from within the family. In all cases, the person/people they saw as responsible was a parent/guardian. For Anthony it was his uncle, for Ashley, Andrew and Angus it was their fathers. For Albert it was his mother, for Arthur it was both parents and cult members, and for Anton it was his stepfather. All had in common that they were exposed to high levels of shaming from very early childhood, and that it continued over a sustained period (until at least between 10-15 years old).

Shaming involved participants' diminution through sustained negative behavior and attitudes towards them by a caregiver. Negative attitude involves being treated in a way that undermines positive self-regard, and promotes feelings of unworthiness. These messages are communicated both verbally and behaviorally. The important quality of these messages, in regards to shame, is that they are directed at the individual's self. Content analysis of these messages show they are about global, internal and stable attributes of the self (Lewis, 1992) such as intelligence and ability.

One of the themes that emerges when considering study group participants' understanding of shame is that it appears to be tied more to achievement than to morality, especially in relation to the early part of life. This can be understood when the messages received through shaming experiences are taken into consideration. The content of most of these messages revolves around ideas that participants do not have the ability to, or will simply never, achieve anything worthwhile in their lives, because of some internal defect (being dumb, stupid or useless, for example). Even in cases where this message was not explicitly stated, it was implicit. Angus and Andrew do not report being told they lacked ability, but when they compare themselves to their fathers, both participants explicitly devalue their ability related attributes (intelligence, dexterity, etc.). Conversely there is extreme over idealization of the father's intelligence, competence, and strength, and both participants describe their fathers as powerful heroes. Through their father's rejection of them, these participants received the message that they were not and would never meet their father's standards of achievement, and therefore, were not worthy of acknowledgement and love.

Furthermore, what made their rejection so shaming is that in each family there was a favorite sibling who was over idealized by their father. This is the case with Albert, Ashley, Andrew and Angus, who report strong feelings of devaluation in relation to their highly valued sibling.

There does not appear to be a strong relationship between shame and the transgression of moral codes in this group. This is based on content analysis of both the shaming messages received as children, and shame-eliciting events later in life. As mentioned above, shaming almost invariably involved 'ability' and related attributes. Content analysis of shame eliciting-situations in adult life reveals shame is predominantly associated with failure to achieve, and in only a few cases is the result of moral transgression. Even where shame is related to a moral transgression, there is a strong association with the idea of failure. For example, Arthur hospitalized his daughter, and, in subsequent years, continued to use violence on his children. Overall, he reports feeling shame because he feels he has failed his children – failed as a parent. Shame associated with the actual hurting of his children is less evident from the transcripts.

Most participants recall feeling ashamed of their family. This was usually a general feeling but was always based on a specific pattern of events that the participant experienced as diminishing. It was often in connection with the degradation through abuse of a significant other. Anton, Albert, Andrew and Arthur regularly witnessed their mothers and or siblings being abused. Arthur reports that he was often exposed to extreme violence between his parents. Also Albert reports high levels of verbal abuse between his parents.

Another source of family related shame is the abandonment of children by parents. Anton, Arthur and Anthony were abandoned by one of their parents, and in Anthony's case both parents, at around 5-6 years old. Anton reports feelings of longing to be with his father, and Arthur says he felt his father never loved him. For these two, as well as Anthony, an absent parent(s) represented not being loved or cared for by that parent. Again it feeds into the realm of unworthiness, not being loved, and therefore shame.

Summary: It has been shown that the family contexts of study group participants were inherently and severely shaming. Many variables are listed including abandonment by father and /or mother, absent father, rejection (unacknowledged)/love withdrawal by father, witnessed shaming of others by significant other, neglected by mother, negative (self) comparison to father, negative comparisons to others (including siblings) by significant other, physical abuse by significant other, verbal abuse/verbal negation (put-downs, etc.) by significant other, sexual abuse by significant other, shamed by significant other's actions, anger from significant other towards participant. No participant experienced all of the above, and all participants experienced at least three of these circumstances as part of the 'usual' family dynamic.

All participants considered shaming to be severe and traumatic, and as well they all linked shaming to low self esteem, feelings of, worthlessness, inadequacy, of being unloved, and of feeling discarded and contemptible.

Control Group: Participants within this group appear to come from families with differing parenting styles and family dynamics. However, on the whole, when asked to describe how they thought about themselves as children, most report feeling positive. Adjectives used to describe themselves included, 'just a normal kid', 'had good self

esteem', 'self confident', 'secure', 'happy'. Even in Noel's case, where he was exposed to harsh physical punishment, he does not talk about himself in terms that reflect low self worth. Nigel describes himself as feeling 'like a bit of an outsider sometimes', because of his family's religious background, but generally he recalls himself as a 'happy kid'.

When asked what influenced their sense of positive self-regard, participants related it back to their parents and the environment that they were brought up in. Statements relating to self and family were characteristically understated and euphemistic. Even though environments varied a great deal, most spoke of simply growing up in a 'pretty good' and secure environment, wherein the overall message was that they (participants) were accepted and that they were 'okay'. Most simply described their childhood experience in terms such as 'average', 'normal'. For most there were no standout issues, or aspects that made them feel especially confident. Rather, they had a feeling of well-being that was always there, and was ostensibly taken for granted.

In all cases, participants report their parents as displaying a positive and respectful attitude towards them. Norman, Nathan and Neil recall that their parents were overtly encouraging of their abilities, and that they encouraged them to pursue interests of their choosing. Both Neville and Nigel felt their parents were encouraging in general, but that they were encouraged in the direction of their respective church communities as opposed to wider social concerns.

For Noel, even though the environment was generally *not* positive, he gained a positive idea of himself through his mastery and accomplishment of jobs. Being the only boy from a low-income family meant he was given jobs and responsibilities that were crucial to the family's well being, such as cutting the firewood, doing lawns, etc.. While receiving praise was not a feature of his experience, he gained a sense of competence and respect as a result of being responsible. Both Noel and Nigel report being good at sports, and that this was an important part of feeling integrated and accepted by peers.

Discipline varied between participants. In all cases, conformity to family rules and standards of behavior was important. Failure in this resulted in punishment, which varied along developmental lines. As young (up to 10 years) children, all participants report being subject to physical and verbal punishment. This typically involved 'a smack' on the legs/hand/bottom etc. Nathan recalls the odd 'clip around the ear'. Each participant reports

the presence and threat of a 'strap' or other such instrument, but these were rarely used. In some cases, participants recall getting a 'talking to'. Punishment was generally carried out by fathers and in most cases was perceived as fair and in proportion to the transgression. Purposeful shaming was generally not reported as part of the punishment repertoire, and, in all but Noel's case, punishment was not remembered as traumatic.

There is a shared pattern of decreasing physical punishment as participants got older, and an increase in such punishments as grounding, limited use of the phone, lost pocket money and having to do unpleasant jobs.

In all of this Noel seems to have been the exception. Punishment for him was sometimes both physically severe and unjustified. He attributes this to his mother's 'fiery temper'. He does not report shaming as part of his overall experience, but he reports being severely shamed by his father on one occasion. This was a traumatic event for Noel, and the consequences were far reaching. His mother had almost died as the result of his distraction and consequent failure to fulfill an important task. Noel says he felt shame over it. But it was his father decrying him as 'lower than the worms', as worthless, that caused his esteem long-lasting damage. He recalls his reaction as wanting to disappear, head down, gaze aversion, incredible pain, and confusion of thoughts, unable to move or speak.

This phase would have faded into history except that his family reused it for months after the event as a form of punishment. Initially punishment involved none of the family speaking to him (including his favorite uncle). After this his sisters chastised him. About this incident Noel says he never felt forgiven by any of his family, and the incident was never mentioned by his parents. He recalls that this was a unique circumstance in his childhood, and that in general he had not been treated in such a way.

Noel also experienced the shaming of his father by his mother. In a typical situation his father would come home drunk, his mother would react angrily, and both physically and verbally abuse and degrade him in front of the family. Noel's sisters were apparently encouraging of this behavior. Noel's shame over his father was exacerbated when his mother asked him to take the role of his father (because he was useless) and be the 'man of the house'. He describes feeling ashamed of his father for not fighting back, for not offering resistance, for allowing his own degradation.

Summary: Participants in the control group characterize their families as generally nurturing and supportive and encouraging. In all but one case, intra-familial shaming was largely absent and participants report positive bonds to parents. Where shaming was reported, it encompassed two aspects namely, witnessing the shaming of one parent by another, and being degraded publicly as a form of punishment for a transgression. It is also noted here that Nigel's father is reported as being largely absent and unavailable, and also 'sometimes' abusive towards Nigel's mother.

Shaming outside the Family

Study Group: There is evidence, that participants experienced shaming in the wider social context. For example, the majority of participants report that during their formative years at school they were either bullied or teased/taunted. Whether they defended themselves (Anthony) or not (Anton), the experience is described as hurtful/painful. All participants, except Ashley and Angus, report being teased and bullied in primary school. The reasons given were varied, but all involved a perceived weakness or defect. In these cases, teasing in the outside world can be seen as an extension, and sometimes a reflection, of the shaming that went on within the family. For example, Arthur was teased by other children for stuttering, and also by his father for the same reason.

Those who were bullied generally report that it had stopped by about 10 years old, although Anthony says that he was teased about his mother and brother (who had polio) at least until he was 14. Teasing and bullying is remembered by participants as ostensibly traumatic and fear inducing.

Control Group: Several participants report being teased at school. There are no reports of bullying. Teasing is reported in several cases but is typically dismissed by participants as 'kids stuff', and as 'no real harm done'. For example, Norman was teased because he had 'buckteeth', but he recalls that everyone seemed to have some attribute that could be, and often was, made fun of. Nigel intimates that he was made fun of because he

was seen as a mum's boy. He appears to have recognized the danger of this status, and proactively sought to change it.

Both Nigel and Noel report shaming by teachers as part of their school experience. Noel recalls public corporal punishment and chastisement, none of which induced a feeling of shame in him.

Nigel recalls being shamed by a teacher in that he was humiliatingly defeated in a power struggle between him and a teacher. He was denigrated as a liar in front of his classmates when in fact it was his friend who had lied. This episode is poignant in Nigel's mind as the moment that triggered his hostility and mistrust at authority which maintains power through shaming.

Neville was also subject to humiliation at school, but by other children. He was teased regularly and chastised for being scared of his protagonists. But unlike Nigel, who had the confidence and skills to get on side with the children who teased him, Neville reports being somewhat helpless. It appears that he saw himself as lacking the skills necessary to deal with the situation, which meant he remained excluded from the 'in group'. Although the instances of shaming (teasing, bullying) outside the home are evident for this group, they lack the intensity and destructive overtone seen in the study group.

Patterns of Anger

Study Group: In the following section, an attempt will be made to identify patterns concerning the emergence of anger in the study group.

The first pattern to emerge from the texts is that concerning age of onset. All participants recall significant periods of anger around the 10-12 years old. Albert, Anthony and Arthur are conscious of chronic angry feelings from around 7 years old. All of those who reported anger at a later age said when questioned that they either probably were, or would have been angry earlier, but that they simply had no memory of it. Despite this variation, participants show a reasonably uniform age of onset of significant anger.

Another pattern to emerge relates to the development of anger over time. When anger is looked at over time, which in the cases at hand involves early childhood (4-6 years

old) until around an average of 40 years old, there are both qualitative and quantitative differences observable at different stages. These changes seem to correspond across participants. In the first 10 years of life, participants tend to report anger, which approximates secondary anger (Greenberg *et al.*, 1993, in Paivio, 1999). Secondary anger is associated by Greenberg *et al.* (1993) with rumination about a situation and is associated with fear and shame (p. 312).

The sense here is that anger is tied to external factors and is situation dependant. Even though a case is being built within this study, that as young children and up to a specified point (a maximum of 11-12 years old), participants didn't see themselves as experiencing anger, it is also possible that they were experiencing it, but remained unconscious of it, or uncomfortable with the feeling it generated. Especially in childhood, anger is likely to have co-occurred with emotions that were more powerful at the time, such as sadness, fear, anguish and despair, and therefore may not have reached a level of prominence sufficient to render it into conscious awareness (Lazarus, 1991).

By contrast, as participants approached 10-12 years old, they report anger as their most prominent emotion. This appears to be the time when increasing cognitive activity, about participants' relationships to others begins to generate more refined theories as to causes of negative events (Thompson, 1989). For example, statements such as 'I began to realize when I was about 10 years old, that the way I was being treated was unfair' are characteristic of participants' statements. For Ashley the particular form taken was that he would never be good enough for his father. For Andrew it was that his father was deliberately degrading his mother. It is not suggested here that participants suddenly became angry about these things, but that they became conscious of *feeling* anger at this stage.

Between the ages of 12-16, participants report high levels of anger. They also report that anger was a defining feature of much social interaction at this time. Anger was 'used' to bully intimidate and exact revenge. This is the emergence of instrumental anger. However, anger was only 'used' outside the home. There is a dramatic increase in violence, aggression and intimidation during this time, and most of the participants took on bullying roles. This pattern of aggression outside the home appears to coincide with

increased tension within the home. As Andrew reports, his father left because Andrew and his brother were becoming physically threatening to him.

However, as young teens (around 12-14 years old), participants were still subject to the authority of dominant parents/caregivers. Shaming patterns persisted, and angry reaction intensified. Participants report a dramatic increase in negativity towards the shaming parent/guardian over this period. Because of fear and/or the persistence of physical threat, the expression of anger within the home or towards the dominant person was generally suppressed. In order to cope with negative feelings, participants began drinking and taking drugs. Prescription drug and/or alcohol dependency is reported for one or both parents for each participant, so these substances were readily available within the home environment. By 12 years old, all except Angus were using drugs and alcohol on a regular basis.

Participants report that, as they progressed from early adolescence through to young adulthood, anger has become a significant part of their lives and perhaps even their personalities. However, environmental and situational factors had a strong influence on manifest anger during this time, either serving to modulate it or increase it. For example, Andrew left home and moved in with his girlfriend, a situation he was happy in. Anthony lived with his brother and began boxing. Both describe feeling good about themselves at these times and report being substantially less angry. Conversely, sharp increases in manifest anger are associated with the deterioration of esteem-enhancing situations for all participants in this group. For example, when Anthony was dropped from the British boxing team, while at the same time losing his girlfriend, he went into an angry state that he says lasted over 10 years.

As participants moved into middle adulthood, instrumental anger appears to become less prominent. Secondary anger remains, but through education, life experience and physical limitations, anger has become less prominent in the attainment of goals and social interaction. In fact for most participants, controlling their anger has become a desirable goal. To varying degrees, there is a shift to personal responsibility and an attenuation of external blame. All participants have completed anger management courses, and it is noted, that most seem reliant on concepts such as empathy and responsibility, which were part of these learning experiences, to define themselves. That is, there is a tendency to say,

‘well I ought to be responsible, because that is what I’ve learned’. Obviously, individuals in this group are making a great deal of effort in changing behavior (e.g., Angus, Andrew, Arthur, Anthony).

There is even a tendency for participants to talk about their anger in the past tense, implying that things are different in the present moment. If anger is talked about in the present tense, it is generally directed at the self, and there seems a conscious effort not to blame others. Albert expresses the difference between his adolescent/young adulthood anger and present anger. He says that for all those years he blamed his mother for making him so angry, yet now he blames himself for keeping it there. However, this may be seen less as a change in anger levels, than an attempt to reduce anger, by shifting its focus. As will be shown, their anger (in most cases) persists, but its expression has been toned down.

Summary: For all participants in this group, anger, as a chronic feeling, emerged early. They describe themselves as chronically angry by 12 years old. A steady buildup of the feeling of anger is reported from around 7-8 years old. This anger appears to lack a target, and is more inwardly expressed as opposed to being directed at certain people or groups. This type of anger is associated with shame and fear, and is interpreted as ‘secondary anger’.

From around 12-13 years old, anger intensifies and becomes more directed and goal oriented. This is identified as instrumental anger. Both instrumental and secondary anger are not seen in the present analysis as separate forms of anger. One is simply a more goal directed expression of the other.

A sense of helplessness and fear in the home contributed to self-medicating behavior, which in most cases started at around 10 years old, and increased steadily over time. Adolescence is marked by extreme substance abuse for all participants in this group.

During adulthood, anger can be seen as an integral part of the participants’ personality and motivation. In this way, anger was very much a part of a social manner or image. However, there are signs that instrumental anger decreases in certain situations, although it is clear that secondary anger, or a mood of anger, is persistent beyond this point.

Control Group: When looking at self reported age of anger onset, participants split roughly into two groups. Four participants (Norman, Neil, Neville, and Nathan) report no significant anger in childhood, and three of these report a steady rise in anger levels after the age of 20. Two participants (Noel, Nigel) report experiencing prolonged and intense anger by the age of 10-11 years, and both report being ‘angry people’ at the time of the interview.

Both Noel’s and Nigel’s anger is quantitatively different from the other four participants. In both cases anger emerged out of a childhood context. Noel’s anger appears to have arisen as the result of prolonged (but not sustained over a long period of years) shaming by his family in relation to a particular event. He admits that he felt shame that he almost caused the death of his mother, but that given some understanding from his family, this shame would have passed. But there was evidently no understanding, nor was there a point at which his family said, he has learned his lesson, we can stop blaming him.

Nigel reports significant anger towards his teacher at 10 years old. He also felt he was wrongly accused, and not given a fair chance to clear his name. He was reduced and humiliated in front of his peers over something he had not done. What is more, his parents were unavailable to stand up for him and so we see anger directed at them as well as the teacher. With both Nigel and Noel, we see anger generalized towards any body or institution that represents ‘invalid’ authority over them

Neville and Neil both report harmonious and anger-free childhoods. Neither is conscious of substantial anger except that which emerged in the context of intimate adult relationships. Both had strong ideals of cooperation and power-sharing within a relationship, which were not realized. Instead their narratives contain themes of deference, inadequacy and powerlessness in relation to their respective partners. Neville talks about anger at himself for his weakness in allowing his partner to dominate him. At the same time he talks about anger at his partner for not respecting him. Within the context of the relationship, the former seems to cancel out the latter in so far as his weakness disqualifies him from the right to respect. According to this line of reasoning, he thereby forfeits the right to be angry at his partner.

Nathan also reports uncharacteristically high levels of anger in relation to his wife. The theme here is one of betrayal and humiliation as the result of his wife's infidelity. Anger relating to the custody battle also relates to themes of betrayal and humiliation in that Nathan lost the court battle to his wife, thus adding insult to injury. His anger is displaced onto the court system, which, in his own reasoning, is a force beyond his control. He appears to have been able to resolve his emotional reaction (anger) by reasoning that he simply had no choice but to accept the ruling. Emotionally, the consequence of that reasoning appears to have been a reduction of shame and anger.

Of the group without childhood anger, Norman is the exception in that his anger arose in relation to social interaction outside the family. In this Norman was intimidated into accepting a situation that was far from acceptable to him. Again there is a theme of powerlessness and humiliation before a more powerful other. Although he does not see himself as an angry person, it is evident by his remarks pertaining to revenge that Norman still carries deep resentment over this shaming incident. Emotionally, there has been no effective resolution of that deep resentment.

Summary: Two participants report a similar pattern of anger development to the study group, wherein anger had emerged by at least the age of 10, taking a chronic but less intense form. These individuals began to 'use' anger from adolescence onwards. Both describe themselves as 'less angry these days', although the texts reveal high levels of secondary anger at the time of the interview.

The other four report childhoods and teen years free from significant anger. However, there is a tendency for these participants to experience moderate and, in some cases, high levels of anger in their adult years. This is commonly reported in connection with relationship difficulties, and involves being diminished by a partner. It is often precipitated by feelings of helplessness and a reduction in self-esteem. This kind of anger is more akin to secondary anger than instrumental anger.

Shame and Anger Interaction Themes

So far different case histories have been presented and similarities and disparities have been worked through in order to establish the various contexts from which shame and anger emerge, and to plot the development of both shame and anger separately. In the following section, both anger and shame themes will be integrated. It has become evident that the relationship between shame and anger develops and changes over time. Over the course of the interviews, naturally occurring categories of time have emerged, and these will be used as a guide for the exploration of changes, vis-à-vis shame-anger. Narratives for both groups divide into 3 broad age-related stages. For the sake of analysis these will be called stage 1, 2, 3. Stage 1 relates generally to childhood, stage 2 to adolescence, and stage 3 to adulthood.

Study Group, Stage 1: As young children, participants in the study group were exposed to chronic shaming in a variety of forms and to varying degrees of intensity. These included rejection, love withdrawal, put-downs, chastisement, and physical, emotional, sexual and psychological abuse. Invariably the pattern of shaming each participant was exposed to, endured throughout childhood. Participants associated the emotions of fear, sadness, distress, and anguish, and in several cases anger with this time.

With the exception of Anton, participants who did not report anger in early childhood appear to have had qualitatively different shaming experiences from those mentioned above. Their experiences were subtler and not so intense. Their relationships with a shaming other had a more ambiguous quality. They were not overtly rejected but they were not wanted either, and as a result they had a high degree of uncertainty about this relationship. On one hand, their fathers were heroic omnipotent figures, who were worshipped by the participants, but who gave no acknowledgment in return. On the other hand, these fathers were largely absent from the household and had little or no positive participation in family life. In such an environment, shaming messages were not as explicit and intense as they were in the cases of Arthur and Anthony. They were instead taken on over time.

When asked about their relationship with the father in such cases, a common sentiment was 'I didn't really know what was going on with Dad', or 'Dad was a bit of a mystery'. Within this context, there is a strong sense of ambivalence (Stein & Trabasso, 1989) towards shaming parents. These parents were both good and bad, loving and unloving. Participants describe craving their father's love and acceptance as children, and there is a strong sense that this is still desired. However, there is also a competing undercurrent of anger towards these same parents. It seems that participants' love for their fathers is set against a deep and abiding sense of resentment for them, and even at the time of the interview this ambivalence was felt strongly by several participants. The notion of ambivalent feelings helps to explain why childhood memories of anger are, for these participants, so 'fuzzy'.

Cases in which anger is reported in early childhood are qualitatively different. Anthony portrays himself as fighting for a cause – to protect the family against shaming others. Arthur, on the other hand, suffered through his father's sadism, and when his father left, Arthur was neglected and abused by his mother, who he describes as having alcohol problems and depression. Arthur was neglected and roamed the streets, stealing, vandalizing and fighting. Both Arthur and Anthony had been rejected and felt unloved, and had very low self-esteem. Both were alienated from 'normal' social life, and, comparison with other 'normal' people, invoked a feeling of shame. All participants talk of feeling inferior or inadequate when comparing themselves to other children, and they all reacted differently to this feeling. Ashley tried to 'out throw' other boys, proving he was better, and Anton allowed himself to be 'picked on'. Arthur and Anthony reacted with anger and violence with the goal, it seems, of reducing the others self-esteem.

Although he was harshly treated by his uncle, as a child, Anthony does not recall feeling anger towards him,. He surmises that he 'might' have felt angry, but that he would not have expressed it out of fear. His fear of his uncle was 'absolute', and he describes being terrified of him. He also talks about being punished severely for the expression of negative emotion (i.e., sadness). There are similar themes in all other study group participants, wherein the home atmosphere was one of fear, and the expression of negative emotion was punished or inhibited through threat and chastisement. Angus sums it up when he says that to express anger to his father about his father, 'just wouldn't be worth

it'. So for this group, direct protest and the expression of negative emotion was 'out of the question' because of fear of the consequences.

As a young child, Anton appears to have reasoned that he was worthless. Until age 10, he says he wasn't conscious of anger, but he was extremely fearful, and reports spending much of his childhood in a state of hiding. Any expression of emotion, whether joy, sadness or anger, was severely punished by his stepfather. When his stepfather 'forced' him to fight back against those who bullied him, he was saying it is not only right, but it is your duty to be angry with those who shame you. Thus previously inhibited anger was given an outlet.

There is strong evidence within the cognitive literature that the relationship between shame and anger is intensified by increases in cognitive functioning (Thompson 1989). Content analysis shows that at around 10-12 years old, participants began to form rudimentary and partial theories that linked the way they felt about themselves with the way they were treated. That is, causal links were being made and developed. For example, Ashley reports that at 5-6 years old he worshipped his father. By 9-10 years old, he resented him because his father would not accept or acknowledge him for himself. That is, Ashley knew by then that contact with his father made him feel small and weak. Albert was being beaten and put down by his mother – he felt hurt, and says he did not know why she treated him this way. But around 7-8 years old onwards, he began thinking more about the reasons for this state of affairs. He knew his mother's treatment of him made him feel 'bad' inside, so why did she do it? One of his first attributions, was that 'maybe that's just what parents do'. In spite of having no clear understanding of why, he says he knew that what was being done to him was wrong, and that he did not deserve such treatment. Anthony also describes being conscious of questioning his uncle's treatment of him from around 8-9 years old.

Stage 2: By 12 years old, all study group participants describe themselves as chronically angry. Some had been angry for several years (Anthony and Arthur) and for others, anger that had been building up began to find expression. There is a theme of working through shame-anger motifs in relation to peers at this time, and several participants report becoming bullies between 10 -13 years old.

Within the home, participants coped with ongoing shaming through withdrawal from family life. All participants report the purposeful avoidance of the shaming parent – staying in their room was the most commonly reported strategy.

All participants, with the exception of Angus, left school and home at around 15 years old. Towards this age, most report more aggressive and overtly angry behavior towards parents. Reaction to the shaming parent was in some cases overtly angry (Anton, Andrew, Albert) while in other cases, out of fear for that parent, such reaction was covertly angry (Ashley, Angus, Arthur). In 2 cases (Anton, Andrew), participants report assaulting a parent. These acts are seen by the participants as retributive justice, and therefore did not induce shame.

All participants report high levels of anger expression outside the home in the wider social context. By the mid-teens (around 16 years), they report actively engaging in anti-social activities ranging from violence, bullying and criminality. All report heavy drug and alcohol abuse by this time. The use of violence and intimidation elevated self-esteem and increased feelings of self worth. Phrases such as ‘violence gave me a sense of power and control’ are representative of participants’ attitudes during this phase.

So on one level, being an angry person had its rewards. Anger was not just a reaction to situational threats. Through aggression, anger was incorporated into identity, an identity which, in some cases, was based on the attributes of, parents who had shamed them. For example, Angus would imagine he was his father when “wading into a fight”. The overall project was to create an image of self as powerful, strong, and fearless, someone who would never again be shamed. These individuals actively cultivated skills that supported the kind of persona they were trying to achieve. To be good at something, especially violence, elevated self-esteem and brought peer recognition, which was non-shaming. The importance to participants of this project is evidenced by the extreme behavior they undertook. If it wasn’t violence (Albert, Anton, Anthony), it was extreme risk taking (Ashley).

In this context, anger is instrumental and is ‘used’ to alter other actors’ perception of the participant. It is part of one’s identity, and as such, it is difficult to construe the shame-anger relationship as one of only cause and effect. That is, that anger results from an instance of shaming. It is not productive, with this group, to talk about emotions as self

contained entities, with one giving rise to the other in a causal chain. Rather, both anger and shame appear to occur within a field of meaning, a term borrowed from the language of phenomenology. By this it is meant that manifestations of shame and anger, as opposed to causes of shame and anger, are generated beyond the purely situational, beyond eliciting situations, and beyond behavior. As is the contention of this study, such chronic feelings of anger, as are evident in this group, can be better understood by thinking about the way in which these individuals themselves construe their lives, the meanings they ascribe to formative relationships, and how they see themselves in the world.

Predictably, this was one of the most difficult areas to explore in the interviews. Several participants were willing to talk about how they now understood themselves and their behavior as they were growing up. A theme that emerges is that participants' 'felt' inadequate, and the fact that much of their motivation was about proving to themselves that they were worthy. Again this is linked to extreme behavior, whether it was work, violence or risk taking. There is, nonetheless, a theme of constant failure in this regard. Ashley, Angus, and Anthony spoke directly of their underlying and persisting sense of inferiority and worthlessness during their teenage years, despite performing heroic acts of daring, strength and fearlessness. Also Albert, who was feared and respected by many, felt unworthy when he met his much-revered brother. They mention that negative self-references, such as 'I always felt like a coward' (Ashley), 'I always felt worthless' (Anthony), and 'I always felt unworthy' (Angus) were recurrent themes to which thoughts of the self inevitably returned.

Stage 3: From 20-30 years old, participants report the same pattern of operating in the world as that just outlined. Intimidatory and aggressive are by now entrenched elements of identity. When asked about the relationship between shame and aggressive/deviant behavior, some say they were ashamed at the time, and others were not. Of those who were not, a range of explanations followed, such as 'I was always drunk or stoned, and therefore was not responsible', and 'did not remember', or 'they deserved what they got', 'violence was just normal to me, that's what I learned at home', 'violence is just the law of the jungle, why should I feel ashamed, I was following the rules', and 'I was angry'.

In cases where shame was acknowledged at the time, participants said that they were unable (at the time) to justify such behavior to others, and to themselves. However, they had obviously felt justified in undertaking the behavior that brought about the shame prior to being caught. In this context, it is as if, having been caught, they saw themselves through the eyes, not of their victims, but of an on-looking moral public. To elaborate, it is possible that they did not feel shame as the result of a transgression (Lewis, 1992), rather, shame was initiated when they were exposed. Lewis (1992) might suggest that they did feel shame, but that it was bypassed. The alternative is that they did not feel shame at all, or in sufficient quantity that it influenced their behavior.

Acknowledged shame (Lewis 1992) from participants' own actions is generally confined to the adult period, between approximately 30-40 years old. All participants see adult shame as associated with their own actions. In some cases these actions resulted from, or were associated with the participant's anger (e.g., Arthur assaulted his wife and children out of rage), and in others, not (i.e., Anton did not sexually abuse his daughter out of anger). However, these shame-eliciting actions caused anger and disgust reactions in a valued other(s) (i.e., wife and/or children). It seems likely that others' display of anger and disgust is the precipitator of shame, and not the shameful act in and of itself. Recall that the trigger for Anton's overwhelming shame at sexually abusing his daughter came not at the time of the act itself, but upon disclosing the act to his wife over the phone.

Blame and anger, normally directed to the outside world, are no longer possible when shame affect is triggered. What is left is anger at the self, which, it is assumed here, was always a silent partner in chronically angry individuals (Kohut, in Miller 1996). Anger at the self is amplified by shame affect (Nathanson, 1992), and in the case of several participants, gave rise to suicidal ideation (and suicide attempts) and major depression.

Participants report that *significant* experiences of shame induced feelings of self-disgust and self-loathing. The experience of shame presented a window, which bypassed usual justifications and attributions for behavior, forcing them to view themselves as the cause of their shame rather than as respondents to outside stimuli or victims of shaming. Direct questioning reveals that shame in this context is invariably tied to the idea that one has lost something of high value through one's own actions. In this context, it appears that

it is not the *violation* of standards (Lewis, 1992) that causes shame. Rather it is the *exposure* of the violation.

Another significant theme is that these instances of shame were followed by periods of fundamental behavior change. Participants report a tendency to seek help at this stage, which appears to incorporate a shift towards appeasement behavior (Keltner & Harker, 1999). From this point of view, shame affect primes the person towards change and appeasement, creating what may be called a 'vulnerability to change'. It is evident from the interviews that significant change may or may not result from these high shame episodes. For example, Albert, after a recent experience of shame, was apt to discount the need for change, because he could justify his actions. On the other hand, Arthur underwent intense therapy and self-development in an effort to regain the trust and custody of his children. Through his shame, Anton sought help and was able to effect positive change to the point where he could present a 'new self' to his family and eventually gain re-inclusion.

Another pattern vis-à-vis shame and the modulation and/or reduction of anger is the observation of the expression of shame in significant others. Anton, Anthony and Angus, and to a lesser extent Arthur, all report significant encounters with parents with whom they had abandonment and/or rejection issues. As mentioned above, it is thought that abandonment and/or rejection by a parent is a major source of a personal sense of shame. It is also the source of considerable anger as evidenced by Anton, Arthur and Anthony.

Anthony, Angus and Anton were fortunate to experience their parents' shame and remorse over their treatment of them. All three describe the effect it had on their lives as profound. In each case they talk of feeling closer to and being able to forgive that person. In the current analysis, it appears that shame has played a significant role in conciliation and forgiveness. To a much lesser extent, even the opportunity to gain the perspective of a 'blamed' other can enhance the process of forgiveness and therefore pave the way for closer relations. Both Arthur and Albert talk of feeling closer to their mothers after hearing their stories. But both men maintain that their respective mothers failed to take any responsibility or show remorse for their parenting failures, either because they denied that any suffering had taken place (e.g., Albert), or that if it did, they were not responsible for it (e.g., Arthur). Consequently, both men expressed high levels of anger towards the parents in question at the time of the interview.

This raises the question of how shame-anger is associated with shaming types of parental relationships? Can the above be interpreted as, individuals who were shamed as children become angry at the shaming caregiver, and that this anger generalizes to other sources via displacement and projection (Buss, 1962), and that to eradicate the source of their anger requires a posture of contrition by the shaming parent? This area was explored with participants from this group, and it was found that the majority of these individuals believed this to be the case.

Participants were asked what they thought it would take to 'lose' their anger. Generally, these individuals felt they had been deeply wronged by shaming parents, and that to witness the parent's shame about this would make a significant difference in their lives. Andrew said it succinctly when he said that to lose his anger would require that his father took responsibility for, and expressed shame over, his ill treatment and abandonment of him. He also expressed high levels of anger towards his father for his behavior.

Summary: Two forms of childhood shaming experiences have been observed. One is overt, brutal, and definitive, leaving little doubt about participants' rejection by a parent/guardian. Fathers in this group had abandoned the family. The other is more subtle and ambiguous, and involves a covertly rejecting male parent/guardian reluctantly playing the role of head of an ostensibly 'conventional' family. The former is associated with the early emergence of secondary anger. The latter is associated with the relatively delayed emergence of secondary anger.

The second decade of life is characteristically begun with an increase in awareness of the causal connection between abuse suffered and low self-esteem. There is a corresponding rise in secondary anger. Anger has begun to be expressed outside the home and in a more instrumental way at around 12-13 years old. Established shaming patterns remain in place, and participants report high levels of anger towards the shaming parent/guardian, as well as towards parents who have abandoned them. Fear of punishment inside the home means that participants have to conceal negative feelings. Participants cope through drug and alcohol abuse.

Through the teenage years, participants report directly/indirectly a pervading sense of inadequacy and unworthiness and the constant need to prove to themselves to others.

There is a rise in instrumental anger as a result. There are no reports of shame over antisocial acts during this stage.

Shame is reported in relation to severe deviant acts during adulthood, and also in some cases shame is reported in relation to a pattern of deviant behavior that occurred over time. A significant episode of shame affect resulted in a drastic reduction of anger and blame towards external agents, and there is a reported increase in self directed anger. The experience of shame precipitated drastic attitudinal and behavioral changes in several participants. In others, old patterns of blaming and anger returned, but even these individuals report that shame was a significant experience.

Finally, experiencing certain forms of shame in others appears to have a positive effect on anger. The participants who experienced shame-based displays of atonement in parents describe the experience as profound and influential in reducing parent related anger. Conversely, in cases where appeasement called for atonement by parents, only to be denied or withheld, anger and negative attitudes towards parents did not decrease.

Control Group: Stage 1 – There are two discernable patterns concerning anger and shame within this group. Four participants report childhoods that were largely free of shaming and significant anger, both as it affected themselves personally and the family as a whole. Self-definitions within this group include, being laid back, easy going, fair, not an angry person. The other sub-group relates to two participants, and shows a pattern of chronic anger, which they themselves associate with shaming by others. Self-definitions for these individuals include, pretty angry sometimes and aggressive.

Participants in the former sub-group characterize their childhoods in positive terms, and report feeling pride in relation to their families. They report feeling respected and encouraged by parents and have positive attitudes towards them. Relationships between parents are reported as close, and authority structures within the family are well defined and respected by participants. Where shame and shaming is reported, it was either outside the family context or related to a specific episode. Neville reports feeling shame in relation to social situations outside the family, and Neil reports feeling shame as the result of a transgression when he was 6 years old.

When Neil was being teased – he got angry – he retaliated in a way that transgressed moral standards (shouting his dead sister's name while knowing it would deeply hurt his antagonist). He reports feeling ashamed that he had hurt his sister's feelings in such a way, and felt remorse and shame. He was reprimanded at the time but there was no chastisement or shaming by others in relation to this event. Therefore no anger resulted.

Neville felt shame as the result of his exclusion from a social group at school. He was not only shunned, he was also teased and mocked by other children. In spite of this, he does not recall anger. He explains that he was confused as to why he was excluded, and attributed it to something about *him* – that he was somehow 'bad' or deficient in some fundamental way, and therefore others were justified in their shaming of him. He never blamed other children for their negative behavior towards him, and therefore felt no anger towards them.

Regarding the second pattern, Noel reports feeling shame over a transgression when he was 6-7 years old. For this transgression, which had near fatal consequences, Noel was blamed and he felt responsibility – he therefore felt shame. That is, blame was attributed to him as an individual and not to his behavior (forgetting the urgency of the situation). He was consequently treated as the person who had almost killed his mother, and was devalued to 'lower than the worms' status by his father and the rest of his family. He was effectively branded and he reports that no effort was made understand his behavior from his perspective. He concluded that the punishment, and the pain that resulted from it far exceeded the crime. He is still angry over this today.

Nigel and Neville both experienced the feeling of being different from other children as mildly shaming. Both report being shy, and feeling like outsiders in so far as they did not fit in with children outside their church community. At 10 years old, Nigel was shamed in front of his class by being called a liar and generally discredited for something he did not feel responsible for. In his words he 'became a different person' at this point – he was angry, and adopted a more aggressive approach ('Dad's style'). It appears that other peoples intentional shaming of him led Nigel to say, 'I've had enough of this'. But he also expresses strong dissatisfaction towards his parents for not defending him in this matter. The underlying focus here is that his father was too busy, and his mother was dismissive of him and did not take his entreaties seriously.

Stage 2: Two patterns are discernable at this phase. They are, participants who report unproblematic emotional development without significant anger or shame, and those who report the presence of chronic anger.

Of the former, the four already mentioned (Neville, Neil, Nathan, Norman), do not report ongoing anger, shaming or a sense of shame during this time. Most report experiencing increased friction with their parents, and the sort of emotional atmosphere referred to here, is tied to the tendency of teens to push the boundaries. Even though it may involve shame and maybe even anger, it is seen in the present context as coming within the range of 'normal' development, and therefore will not be considered further.

Out of this group, the cases of two participants (Norman and Neville) will be further discussed. Norman reports that he felt shame as the result of a transgression. It was in the context of sexual experimentation, and Norman was part of a sexual encounter wherein the female who had been involved voluntarily (initially anyway), became distressed. Her status changed to involuntary and Norman then found himself in a situation that involved the violation of the girl's rights. He felt shame (and guilt) as the result of being involved, but not anger (maybe at himself). This is possibly because he took responsibility for his part and did not externalize blame.

Neville was still shy in high school and found it impossible to mix socially. He reports a gathering conviction that the fault lay within him, and this resulted in a heightened self-consciousness about the way he was seen by others. He developed a fear of approaching others, which fed into his sense of inadequacy. He describes a low-level frustration with himself for not being able to change the situation, but that this did not manifest itself in a significant way.

Noel and, to a lesser extent, Nigel, report feeling high levels of anger during their teens. Noel's anger is reported to be in relation to what he saw as increasing dysfunction within his family. Although he says there was shaming (belittling, putting down, diminishing) of him by others it was neither severe nor ongoing. Physical punishment was often severe and unfair, but in general negativity towards him decreased as he became older and more important in the running of the house. He says the thing that made him angry was the shaming of his father by his mother. This applies particularly to the fact his father never defended himself. No doubt Noel felt what Lewis (1992) calls empathic shame

(e.g., shame when one witnesses the shaming of another), and that this caused him distress. But he also felt ashamed of his father for not resisting the beatings and verbal abuse. In a way he renounced his father, saying he preferred to think he had no father.

Nigel reports that he could get angry in his teens, but that his anger found form as part of an anti-authoritarian attitude rather than at a specific person or situation. He says that the humiliating incident with his teacher was never forgotten and that it helped to shape his attitudes. It appears also that two opposing forces - his angry and absent father, and his passive mother, influenced his attitudes. Nigel experienced his parents as not being there when needed help, and when he did go to his father, he found that the confidentiality of their relationship was betrayed. This helps to account for Nigel's 'don't trust anyone' attitude.

Stage 3: The overall pattern in this group in adulthood can be summed up as a general increase in anger. What is more, shame and/or shaming appears to play an important role in the emergence of anger in most cases.

Both Neil and Neville report experiencing prolonged feelings of anger as the result of their partner's behavior towards them. Both experienced belittlement and diminution, which resulted in a general feeling of inadequacy and helplessness. That is both experienced prolonged shaming by their partners, both report a build up of anger and resentment in response to this and both report explosive outbursts of anger quite uncharacteristic of their normal temperaments. Both report a decrease in tolerance to shaming not only by their partners but also more generally (Neil's road rage incident is an example). This is interpreted by both as a permanent change in their temperaments, whereby anger is much closer to the surface, and is now a more integrated part of their socio-affective system.

Norman's experience with the boat-repair man also appears to have changed him, in the sense that the anger from that episode was unresolved and therefore has embedded itself as part of his socio-affective system. Although he tries not to think about this episode, he admits it left a bitter taste and is always there as such.

Nathan was also left with a bitter taste. When he talks about his wife's affair and his custody battle with her, his face contorts into an expression of bitterness/disgust/anger. His speech changes, taking on an urgency, which makes him trip over his words. The only

emotions he reports in relation to both events are anger and hurt. He also indicates that there could have been shame there but that he wasn't aware of it. It is arguably the case though that Nathan's bitterness over his marriage breakup is rooted in the pain of having been rejected by her, the public humiliation of this, and the betrayal by one so trusted. All of these ideas are linked to the emotion of shame, in that they reduce the person's public standing. An example of this is Nathan saying that he felt shame in relation to his parents, in that he had failed to reach the standards of marriage that they had set. An indication of the level of shame felt is Nathan's impulse to disappear, to get away from all that reminded him of this failure, including his wife.

Noel also experienced an increase in both anger and depression in adult years. As an adult he describes himself as tense to be around and generally angry. Several anger-eliciting situations have been described above (see case study – anger section), all of which had at their core humiliation and rejection. His wife's affair was intensely humiliating and shaming for him, as was her reaction (she dismissed him as pathetic), and having to function among a public who had knowledge of, but who stayed silent over the affair.

Noel expected some kind of expiatory acknowledgement from both wife and lover, and despite his efforts in this direction none was forthcoming. Ultimately, he was left to try and resolve feelings of rejection and humiliation, and the anger at those who caused it in him, in the psychotherapist's chair. Traditionally he had resolved these feelings with intimidation and/or violence, which he asserts was always and only directed at those who sought to make a fool of him.

Besides these anger provoking situations, Noel talks about his anger in broader terms. He indicates a link between 'his anger' and the shaming of his father by his mother, and of himself by his family in general. He always felt judged as the 'black sheep', the moody and sullen one, and the one who rejected the status quo. Noel describes the present situation of the family as one of denial regarding any contribution they may have made to his predicament. His anger therefore, appears incomprehensible to them. For them the problem is in Noel. For Noel, the problem is in the family.

Noel makes a direct and casual link between his parents and his relationship, and his ongoing anger and depression. He expresses a strong desire to reduce his chronic anger, and the only way that he sees of achieving this is to confront his parents and tell them how

he feels about how they treated him. In a personal communication post-interview, he admits to having anxiety over the likelihood that, a) the shock will affect his mother's physical health and, b) that they will reject his point of view as well as any responsibility. Reduction of Noels anger seems to hinge on, a) being heard by his parents and, b) acknowledgement of the validity of his claims. Put another way, he believes that his deeply embedded anger would be altered were he to receive some kind of shame-based gesture from his parents.

Summary: Participants in this group divide roughly into two sub-groups. They are, those whose childhoods are characterized by high levels of security, encouragement, respect, and family cohesion. The other sub-group is characterized by family patterns, which are marked by more hostility between parents, less loving encouragement, and much higher levels of aggressiveness.

On average all individual, in the control group were shamed a lot less during childhood, and when they were, it was in connection with punishment. Participants report high levels of anger in instances where shaming (and the resulting pain) was felt to far exceed the seriousness of the transgression. Where a feeling of shame was felt as appropriate by participants, and that they were not made to feel a level of shame that was disproportionate to the transgression, anger was felt as self-reproach, and was transient in nature.

Participants report varying degrees of anger and frustration during their teenage years. In some cases this is accounted for as part of an adolescent push for independence, but in at least two cases, anger is seen by the participant as a continuation of negative feelings deriving from childhood. Where shame derives from a perceived defect of the self or from a transgression, for which the participant takes responsibility, feelings of frustration and anger are relatively mild and directed at the self. Where childhood anger emerged from a shaming related context, participants recall persistent and hostile feeling during adolescence.

As adults, there is a strong pattern of anger as a reaction to being shamed by other actors. For the high anger participants, reported instances of anger invariably followed situations in which they felt they were being shamed, and anger was expressed at

institutions that were seen as shaming (e.g., the police). Other participants, some of whom had very little previous experience with anger, report a drastic lowering of anger thresholds, especially in situations in which they experienced a reduction in self esteem (e.g., Neil's anger towards his wife's shaming of him, Neville's anger at his wife's shaming of him).

As well as situational anger, Noel talks of experiencing anger as an enduring feeling. He says that he is angry about shame-related family dynamics such as his father's acceptance of being shamed and the fact that he was not there in support of Noel.

Coping and Shame Modulation Themes

In the 'Shame and Anger' section of the case studies, Nathanson's shame modulation strategies were elaborated for each participant. In the following, the main themes from those case studies will be pulled together in order to identify patterns both within groups and between groups. In the interest of contiguity this analysis will be set against the stages used in the previous section.

Study Group: For the study group at stage 1, the principle strategy for shame modulation and avoidance is withdrawal. That is, all participants actively avoided social situations associated with shame, seeking to keep a low profile both inside and outside the family. Inside the family this involved avoiding the attention of a shaming other through such strategies as, inhibiting emotional expression (e.g. dissociation), inhibition of verbal expression (saying only what is required), staying away from home whenever possible, and avoiding proximity to the shaming other (e.g., staying in own room etc.).

Two participants also described behavior consistent with Nathanson's *attack other script* (Anthony, Arthur), which included direct violence and anger displays towards shaming others. All participants (with the exception of Angus) had by the age of 9-10 years old, begun to experiment with drugs and alcohol as a means of numbing unbearable feelings. According to Nathanson, this is a strategy from an *avoidance script*.

At stage 2, all participants report behavior from two clear-cut domains of shame modulation. They are the strategies of avoidance and attack other.

As can be seen from the preceding section (Shame and Anger Interaction: Themes), all participants in the study group, with the exception of Angus, were operating from an *attack other script* by the time they were 12-13 years old. That is, participants report that their focus during this period was on gaining a better feeling about themselves, primarily by reducing the self-esteem of others. A wide variety of behavior is associated with this strategy, the most commonly reported being violence and intimidation. Other behaviors reported include verbal abuse, psychological abuse and destruction of others' property.

All participants describe behavior that derives from an *avoidance script*. This strategy has to do with avoiding the feeling of shame through escape, whether it is drug or alcohol induced, work or recreation induced, or any other strategy that can offer an alternative view of the self to the self and the outside world (Nathanson, 1992). *Avoidance* strategies involved the heavy abuse of substances including alcohol, solvents, marijuana, prescription drugs, and opiates. All subjects report chronic usage of at least two of the substances listed by the age of 18, and in several cases heavy usage was reported as young as 12 years old. Other avoidance strategies involved the over-development of skills and abilities at work and sport. Characteristic of this strategy is the need to be the best at whatever one does, be it work, sport or hobby. It is to say, 'I am good at that, I must be 'okay'. For example, Ashley could outwork anyone, Anthony saw himself as the best boxer, and Albert was tough and fearless.

At stage 3 the same two scripts just mentioned are evident. The difference here is that circumstances such as marriage and having children seems to have intensified script behaviors. For example, there is a strong theme of controlling others through intimidation at stage 2, but when this behavior is brought into the family, it reaches a higher level of dysfunction. Six out of seven participants report physical and emotional abuse of their spouses, and it can be deduced that the same six inspired chronic and intense fear in their children through coercive power assertion (Magai, Distel, & Liker, 1995). Also evident in all texts from this group are strongly held negative attitudes and beliefs about institutions of authority such as the IRD, the police, the education system and politics. High levels of anger are expressed towards these institutions because they are seen as shame-inducing in

their authority. Consequently, individuals within these institutions are seen as worthy only of the participant's contempt.

Patterns of alcohol and drug abuse also continued into adult life, and in all cases had a destructive effect on participants as well as those around them. Family life appears as a paradox in the context of shame avoidance, in that being the 'head of a family' brings a unique status and so can be seen as a shame-reducing. However it is evident from all of the case studies in this group that intimate relations and anger-driven authority are also potentially potent sources of shame (Nathanson, 1992). Work also takes on more salience as a shame modulating strategy in adulthood, and is associated by four of the seven participants with increased self-esteem.

That is to say, for most of their adult lives, participants operated according to scripts that began in adolescence. Three participants (Albert, Anthony, Ashley) report no change in their behavior until around 40 years old. Anton and Andrew were about 30 when they changed their core behaviors, and Arthur was about 35 when he did the same.

Control Group: It has been shown above, that 5 out of 6 participants in this group were not exposed to high levels of shaming, and so never experienced high levels of shame. In the case where shame is identified (Noel), the immediate response was one of *withdrawal*. To a lesser extent, withdrawal behavior is also identified in the cases of Nigel and Neville. Both report being shy and withdrawn, but only when it came to certain aspects of socializing at school.

At stage 2 there are a greater variety of script combinations in operation than was seen in the study group. In only one case (Nigel) do we see clearly identifiable behavior related to both *avoidance* and *attack other scripts*. Nigel was evidently very much aware that the image one shows to the world influences the way one is perceived by the world, and that this image can be manipulated. So Nigel talks about the very conscious process of becoming popular with those around him. In this way he could hide behind a façade which said to the world, 'none of what you say about me affects me'. It is also evident with Nigel that this *avoidance* strategy gave away to *attack other* behavior generally towards the mid teens (approx. 16-17 years old) after his parents had separated. As well as physical

violence, he appears to have thrived on the idea that others feared him, and that he was somehow 'above' the banality of mainstream society.

Noel reports that as a teenager, he was angry and withdrawn. His narrative does not signify a need to prove himself aggressively, rather his anger was more internally held. His pattern of aggression is qualitatively different from that seen in the study group in that he reacted with anger reluctantly, and only after considerable provocation. So it appears that his *attack other* behavior is more closely aligned with a *withdrawal script* than with an *avoidance script*, as was implied for Nigel.

With the other four participants in this group, there is no evidence of *attack other* behavior. Strategies for shame modulation appear to be mild forms of *withdrawal*. These individuals portray themselves as quiet and shy, and in three cases could be said to have been socially withdrawn. Also evident, is a tendency for these participants to avoid feelings of shame through disavowal, denial, and rationalization. For example, Normans approach is to put thoughts associated with shame out of his mind, or reinterpret the circumstances in a way that does away with shame. This strategy is firmly within the *avoidance script* pole of the compass of shame.

At stage 3 there are some noticeable changes in scripts for this group. Neville, Nathan, Norman and Neil have experienced shame for the first time as the result of being shamed by another person. All four appear to have used rationalization in an attempt to understand the motivation of the other person, and thereby divert attention away from their own sense of shame. As mentioned already, this is part of an *avoidance* strategy. Where shaming was ongoing, participants report uncharacteristically high levels of anger. Neville tended to handle the resulting powerful feelings initially by keeping himself busy, and later by drinking heavily. Neil handled powerful anger feelings by expressing them, but ultimately rationalized that his partner's shaming behavior was part of her own 'baggage'. Both of these participants reveal an increased propensity to experience anger when they feel they are being purposefully shamed, and admit that they are more likely to retaliate with anger in these situations.

Nigel reports that for the first time he has experienced shame over his actions, and that it has left him disorganized and feeling defeated. Typically he is handling shame

through an *avoidance script*, with excessive alcohol use and the disavowal of feelings through rationalization, and denial of responsibility.

Both Noel and Neville say they have ‘mellowed a lot’ and that they are not so angry any more. However, a strong propensity to denigrate and berate others is still evident. As mentioned earlier, both have a long list of institutions and lifestyles they readily turn their anger towards. But both of them have withdrawn from social life, and therefore shame provoking situations. Therefore their *attack other scripts* appears to consist largely of words and attitudes, and lacks the physical aspects reported earlier.

Discussion

The present study set out to explore the relationship between shame and anger using a comparative, multi-case case study design. Two groups were given a semi-structured interview, which tapped participants' memories and perceptions of shame and anger in relation to their lives from earliest memories until the present day. This allowed the researcher to examine the relationship between shame and anger over broad contextual domains, which included childhood, adolescence and adulthood. Such a broad approach also enabled the researcher to explore questions such as, what are the circumstances that create shame? Are they characteristically different for different groups of people, or will the same shame-eliciting events cause anger in 'normal' men? Are high-anger men consciously aware of shame in their lives, and if so, what can they tell us about how shame might lead to anger? Does the relationship between shame and anger change over time? Is a sense of shame modifiable over time? For example, will childhood shame remain intact over time? The aim of the analysis was to look for patterns which might add to the existing knowledge about the relationship between shame and anger.

The results show that for the high anger group, shame and anger form a dynamic relationship which remains in-tact over time. It has been shown that both shame and anger were propagated within the family environment, that this relationship changed over time, and that at the time of interviewing, high levels of anger were expressed concerning childhood shaming. This research is interested in the mechanisms and dynamics of this relationship. Therefore, a good place to begin this discussion might be to ask how this relationship comes about. It was found that children do not appear to react to childhood shaming with anger. That is, the shift from shame to anger is not automatic, but rather is the result of a process in which particular socializing factors are salient. What will follow is a discussion relating to the processes that underpin the shift from shame to anger in childhood.

Cognitive developmental researchers such as Lewis (1992) and Ross Thompson (1986) theorize cognitive-attribution model to explain the transition from shame to anger in children. That is, rather than shame affect being triggered automatically, it is triggered

via an attribution process. Cognitive developmentalists such as Piaget (1932) have shown that up until around 7 years old, a child will make relatively simple attributions about why they are punished. They will characteristically see themselves as deserving the punishment (no matter how severe) simply because the adult is punishing them (p. 258).

In Piaget's view, up until the age of 7, children tend to equate adult behavior as fair and just. In this view, if a child is verbally/physically abused, they will attribute this happening to something about themselves. According to Weiner & Graham (1986, in Thompson, 1989), if a young child attributes abusive treatment of the self to a *global* and *stable* defect of the self (such as lack of ability, being bad, or unlovable), the resulting emotion will be shame (p. 121). According to these authors, this attribution is very likely in children under 7-8 years old, because they lack the cognitively complexity to make more sophisticated causal attributions and appraisals.

Weiner & Graham (1986) posit a two-stage model of emotional reaction, where the first stage involves fairly simple 'primary appraisal'. They tie this level of appraisal to outcomes that are within either/or categories, such as good/bad, success/failure, and define the resulting emotions as outcome dependant (p. 122). Although many studies from the cognitive literature, use 'task performance' as the unit of measurement, it is also possible that children will make attributions about self-related failure, especially as measured within social interaction and sense of efficacy.

At around the age of 9 years old children begin to acquire the ability for more complex reasoning (Piaget, 1932), and can therefore make more complex causal attributions. Weiner and Graham (1986) refer to this process as secondary appraisal. At this stage, children begin to include others' intentions within their attribution schemas, and according to the authors, emotions become more dependant on attributions, as opposed to being outcome dependant, as is the case at the primary appraisal stage. Within their taxonomy of attribution dependant emotional responses, Weiner and Graham predict that anger will result when one's failure (shame) is attributed to another's intervention (p. 122). Within the study group, it is not failure at a task that is at issue, but a sense of oneself as a failure – failing to be lovable and worthy.

This approach helps to explain the finding that, although young children were extensively shamed, they did not feel anger until around 9 years old. It also goes some way

to explaining the apparently uniform emergence of anger in the study group at around 9-10 years old, and the ensuing rise in anger over the adolescent years. That is, participants in the study group became increasingly angry because of a growing awareness that the reasons for their mistreatment resided not in them, but within the person who mistreated them. This is also the age according to Piaget (1932) that we begin to comprehend parents' imperfections.

The above seems to explain the emergence of the shame-anger relationship. But it must be asked what it is that keeps it going over time? Researchers and theorists from different areas of psychology tend to treat this relationship in slightly different ways. The reader is directed back to the introduction for an outline of relevant perspectives. In brief, Lewis (1992) argues that anger becomes an emotional substitute for shame, and so within the shame-anger relationship, shame may not be consciously felt; rather it is 'bypassed'. Shame comes about in the first place, according to Lewis because of a violation of standards, rules and goals.

For the high-anger group, it does appear that participants felt that they did not measure up to interpersonal standards. That is, they all report low self-esteem and a sense of inadequacy in relation to other people. If standards are talked about on this level, then Lewis's theory helps to account for shame in study group members. However, if standards, rules and goals are seen in the context of specific actions, such as feeling shame over the abuse of one's children, then it does not help us so much. This is because, although high anger participants reported high levels of anti-social, and abusive behavior as adolescents and young adults, they invariably do not associate these with shame. Did Anton experience shame when he violated the moral standard of knocking his wife out on the street for example? He does not report feeling shame at the time. Or did he experience shame, but wasn't conscious of it because it had been bypassed? The data indicate that this is not the case either.

In general, participants could identify instances in adulthood about which they felt shame, but these were very few. So for some transgressions, shame was felt, but for most, it wasn't. If shame were bypassed, one would expect that this would be the case all of the time. Lewis proposes that somehow we choose anger as a shame substitute. Why then would we choose it sometimes, and not at others? After all, shame is always painful and

unwanted, so why, given a reliable alternative, would someone choose to experience shame at all?

Donald Nathanson (1992) sees the anger component of the shame-anger relationship as a response to a 'painful reduction in self-esteem', specifically about 'matters of personal size, strength, ability, and skill', collectively known as 'body ego' (p. 317). The shame component in this context is tied to the humiliation experienced when one is exposed as deficient in matters relating to 'body ego'. Because affect is triggered automatically according to Nathanson (pre-cognition), the shame-anger relationship is such that, shame affect is triggered first, which in turn brings up a script that incorporates anger. Anger came to be part of the shame script because the individual learned that the experience of anger reduces shame, or dissipates the feeling of shame. This is also the logic of Lewis's (1992) theorizing. Nathanson's theory seems to presuppose that anger scripts are learned, and therefore they require an environment wherein anger can be modeled. In fact all participants in the study group said that much of their angry behavior had been learned within the family environment.

We see this with Angus, who reports that he modeled his aggressive behavior on his father. Andrew got angry and smashed the stereo, punched holes in cupboards, and threatened his wife with a poker. He explains that his father did the same. Albert also alludes to a desire to be like his father, tough and unforgiving. However, these are behaviors, and it cannot be inferred from the learning of behaviors that one is taught to be angry. There is a behavioral element to all emotions, which derive from social learning and modeling, and this can be seen as the general area of 'expression'. But the expression of an emotion is not the emotion. Nathanson (1992) does in fact suggest that anger is a part of 'the reactive phase' of shame, wherein shame affect is triggered, with anger one possible reaction to it.

So in the area of transgression of standards and rules, if there are rules that govern the interaction of shame and anger, they do not seem to be imbedded within, or exclusive to the emotions as entities. That is, there does not seem to be an inherent property of shame that necessarily causes anger. One area in which consistency was found when considering shame-anger has to do with the anger that arises from being shamed by another person.

Participants from both groups report becoming angry when they felt another person shamed them. Anger from shaming represented the most decisive and universal configuration of the relationship under investigation. What the results imply is that on a broad conceptual level, the relationship between shame and anger seems to be governed by a mechanism, which is common to individuals, no matter what kind of socialization they have experienced. That is, shaming in childhood, or harsh socialization, did not singularly account for anger that arose as the result of shaming. Participants who were never exposed to shaming and harsh punishment during childhood reported high levels of anger in reaction to being shamed as adults.

This brings into focus the area of shame-proneness or vulnerability to shame. For example, can we infer that high-anger individuals are shame prone, and are thereby more likely to become angry when shamed? The results suggest that non-angry individuals are equally sensitive to shaming, and as likely to react with anger. This finding could reasonably be generalized to the wider population by saying that everybody is sensitive to shaming, and likely to react with anger. The shame-proneness construct has heuristic value, but whether it reflects a vulnerability to shame-anger is an assertion that is far from conclusive at this stage.

An alternative way to approach the notion of shame proneness might be to look at it as a fluid concept, as opposed to a fixed disposition. Rather than seeing shame proneness as a part of one's disposition or personality, it could also be more transient, and may reflect periods or stages, wherein a person is more sensitive to shaming than at other times. A case in point is Neil, who was over twenty years old before he experienced protracted shaming. Neville was over 30 years old before he was exposed to shaming. Both admit to being more sensitive to shaming now, and report that their threshold of tolerance for being shamed has steadily decreased as a result. By all accounts both of these individuals are not generally shame prone, but within the context presented here are increasingly more vulnerable to chronic anger.

However, there were differences between groups as to what they considered as shaming, and major differences as to the intensity and expression of anger. Study group participants were extreme both in the amount of shame they were exposed to, their low sense of self-regard, and anger expression. Control group participants had on average not

been exposed to high levels of shame, had more positive self-regard, and were generally milder in their anger expression. However, all participants report feeling anger as the result of being shamed.

When considering the situations which different people find shaming, the two groups showed, what the researcher interprets as, an orientation to either ability related issues (study group) or moral/justice (control group) issues. On one side, this finding upholds Nathanson's (1992) idea that anger will result from shaming apropos body ego matters, with high shame individuals being particularly sensitive to attacks on strength, ability, and skill. For these people, strength, control and ability are overly important. To be reduced is to allow others to view them as weak and shamed. High anger individuals report enduring patterns of negative self-concept characterized by strong feelings of inferiority, inadequacy and incompetence. However, their outward behavior is clearly oriented towards presenting an image of being in control, tough, powerful, and fearless. Therefore self-esteem relies almost completely on maintaining this image for the high anger individuals that were studied.

For most of the control group, self-esteem was not associated to the same extent with the macho tough guy image seen in the study group, and therefore Nathanson's (1992) ideas seem less applicable to non-angry participants. This is particularly evident within the family context. It has been shown that study group men were likely to react with violence and anger to perceived challenges to their authority as head of the family. Control group participants tended to value egalitarian relationships and cooperation, and to focus on issues of fairness. Neil for example felt he was doing his best to provide for his wife and family's needs, yet was put down by his wife. He felt shamed, but was angry at what he perceived as his wife's selfish disruption of family harmony.

It appears then that the two groups experienced a shame-anger sequence, and that the sequence is underpinned by thoughts that have to do with status within the intimate relationship. Study group participants appear to be concerned with control, and so anger is a reaction to a reduction of their credibility as an authority. Control group members appear to react because of thoughts associated with not being credible as equal partners in an intimate relationship. This difference suggests that while the structure underlying the

shame anger relationship is common to both high and low shame individuals, the content is qualitatively different.

The question is asked, what is it about the shame experiences seen in both groups that cause the shift from shame to anger? Is it that shame is so aversive that a switch is made to the more bearable emotion of anger as suggested by Lewis (1992)? In his model, shame is largely 'bypassed' or at least not identified, and the switch from one to another is largely automatic or beyond awareness. Or is a script which incorporates anger triggered at the moment in which a reduction in self-esteem is felt, as suggested by Nathanson (1992)?

Both of these ideas rest on the assumption that shame is triggered or experienced prior to anger. Participants report feeling 'bad' and inadequate at the moment of shaming, and in some cases they talk of an automatic response. However, shame-anger is inevitably embedded within a situation which builds up over a period of time. The data suggests a more conscious and protracted process is involved than in Nathanson's (1992) theory. For example, Participants in both groups reported having what could be called 'theories of intention': an idea about what they thought the shaming person was trying to achieve by shaming them.

Following Nigel's reasoning, it is reasonable to say that anger will result if the shaming person is trying to make themselves look better through the humiliation of another. Even onlookers are likely to become angry at witnessing this, if they feel it is unjustified. This suggests that there may be nothing inherent within the experience of shame as an emotion, which gives rise to anger. Rather anger may or may not result from the emotion of shame, and the outcome either way, is likely to be dependent on the meaning derived from the situation, which is to a large extent reliant on the context. That is to say, that anger is only one of many possible reactions to being shamed. It is however, reasonable to say that the longer one is shamed, the more likely it is that anger will be the result.

So far, we have talked about shame and anger as felt emotions or entities (Gilbert, 1998, in Gilbert and Andrews, 1998). But when trying to understand shame-anger within a phenomenological context, the limitations of conceptualizing shame and anger this way are many, and some have been identified above.

A more constructive way of understanding shame-anger may be to look at long term constructs, such as dispositions or traits. It is evident from the accounts given by participants in the study group that shame is being constantly generated internally. This level of shame is associated with a pervading belief that one is inadequate, unlovable, ugly, unwanted, or defective in some fundamental way. Everything that has been said about angry reaction to shame indicates that individuals harbor a latent desire that this is not true, that to think of oneself as defective is to exist in an unwanted reality. The situation arises wherein an individual is generating negative thoughts about the self, and that these thoughts are aversive, and painful. Based on the data, these thoughts exist across time.

For the study group, negative thoughts about self have been clearly identified as originating from childhood shaming. Here there are three discernable sources of ongoing anger in relation to childhood shaming. The first is the knowledge that one's shame was caused, not by one's own transgressions, but by another person. This idea was made explicit by several study group participants, and can be paraphrased as 'I feel shame, but it is not my shame, although I carry it, it belongs to someone else'. This aspect of anger has to do with attribution, which has been discussed above. Therefore it will not be discussed here.

The second source of anger is the reality that one's very being (global self), has been denigrated through parenting, either through abandonment or ongoing abuse and neglect. The author is in agreement with Miller (1996) when she suggests that a child has an innate expectancy to be nurtured and cared for, and the violation of this expectancy is in itself shaming. This is also in line with Kohut's (1973, in Miller, 1996) ideas about the origin of shame. However, Kohut theorizes that with infantile shame comes rage, i.e., they are more or less born together. As already demonstrated, anger vis-à-vis shame-anger, is thought by the author to emerge towards the end of childhood. This would tend to separate the current conception of shame-anger from Kohut's narcissistic rage and H. B. Lewis's (in Lewis, 1992) humiliated fury, in the sense that both of these views see shame-anger as a fixed relationship, that begins in childhood, and remains more or less unchanged into adulthood.

The third source of anger, comes from the self-perpetuation of a negative self-concept (enduring thoughts of one's unworthiness). The main issue here is that once this pattern of negative self-relating has been set in childhood, it appears to be more or less stable across time and place. These thoughts are generated internally and therefore are not

dependent on reflection by others. This is the basis of Nathanson's (1992) idea of a shamed self, wherein one's shame is inescapable, because it is part of the self. Or to use Lewis's conception of the subjective and objective self, the self cannot escape the view of itself as shamed, because both levels, the subjective and objective, are thoroughly shamed.

It has been suggested that once in place, negative sense of self is not dependent on the social world for its existence. The source of anger at this stage is internal. All of the individuals in the study group alluded to the same thing. That is, it was not anything inherent in the outside world that made them angry, rather, anger was simply there, and they were often not aware of being angry, and were therefore oblivious to its source. Recall that Anthony reports being in a constant state of agitation and upset for no apparent reason. His anger would build up, and he would drink to relieve the tension. .

People are embedded in the social world and behavior takes place in a social context, wherein we constantly perceive other people and are constantly perceived by them. Indeed, much of the literature on shame-anger deals with manifestations of emotions in social settings. That is, emotions are elicited from without, and they are observed and studied from without. But we also imagine social interaction on many levels, and we imagine that other people are imagining us. We could call this a process. This process is constituted by cognitions, perceptions and emotions. Neither is epiphenomenal (Lewis, 1992), they are simply interacting, with one constantly influencing the other. If shame and anger more or less constitute the emotional side of this process, which appears to be the case with study group participants, then one would expect the whole process to produce thoughts and feelings colored by both shame and anger. Recall that Ashley realized that anger was the only emotion that he was aware of experiencing. If he had construed his negative self-image as shame (which is the view taken by the author), then he would have said that anger and shame were the only emotions he was aware of.

Ashley's manifest behavior must then be seen as a reflection of his inner state (referred to as a process above). In this view, emotions of shame and anger are not elicited by either internal or external stimuli, they are more or less constant experiences, which both give rise to behavior and social experience, which in turn gives rise to manifestations of emotions such as anger. But it seems unlikely that beyond a certain point, possibly

around nine or ten years old, a negative pattern is in place, which despite social experience, will generate both shame and anger for as long as the pattern stays in-tact.

The discussion will now turn to another configuration of the shame-anger relationship. It is suggested here that not only does shame (shaming) give rise to anger, but shame can also reduce and dissipate anger. There are two main areas identified within the study in which an experience of shame acts to reduce anger. The first involves the kind of shame that may come about as the result of a serious transgression of a moral nature. The second involves witnessing atonement-related shame in another person.

Several participants reported major episodes of acute shame as the result of a moral transgression. For Anton the transgression involved the sexual abuse of his daughter, for Arthur it was the physical abuse of his children, and for Ashley it was the physical abuse of his son. In these instances, participants recall being 'crippled' by shame, to the point where they were unable to function. It has been suggested elsewhere in this report that shame will only be felt if the individual accepts responsibility for the transgression. With the exception of Ashley, participants were unable to avoid responsibility, because their transgression became public knowledge. It was at this stage that shame was experienced, and not at the time of the transgression.

The effect that shame had on participants may be seen as conforming to the textbook description of felt shame is also out of the textbook (i.e., disorganized thoughts, wanting to disappear, self loathing, etc.). They literally shut down, and their full focus was on themselves. They could not face other people, and could only contemplate the wrongness of their behavior, and the effect it had on others, mainly on their families. After these shame experiences, participants were motivated to change destructive patterns of behavior, and generally sought help in doing so. They report an overall decrease in anger after gaining help. The point here is that shame, as a felt emotion, does not appear to give rise to anger, and is likely to reduce it in high anger individuals. Furthermore, the experience of shame appears to have inspired appeasement behavior in the sense that participants were forced to make substantial changes in behavior if they were to reconcile with their families. In this context it is not clear whether the experience of shame serves to modify the emotion of anger, or whether it triggered self-help behavior, which in turn impacted on chronic anger.

The second way in which shame was reported as reducing anger involves shame as a conciliatory emotion, but this time it is not *felt* by the self. Rather, it is witnessed in somebody else. The results indicate that a gesture of atonement, made by a parent towards high-anger participants reduced negative feelings, including anger towards that parent.

Keltner & Harker (in Gilbert & Andrews, 1998) review forty studies that view shame from an appeasement perspective. These authors propose that displays of shame elicit sympathy, which in turn facilitates forgiveness, and thereby reduces shame in the one who feels it. Following this line of reasoning, it may also be true that a heart-felt apology from a parent to an adult son or daughter for the suffering the parent had inflicted on that person as a child, would lead to a reduction in both anger and shame in the one who receives the apology. It is one of the unforeseen surprises of this study that several participants have experienced just such an apology.

In the analysis section, it was shown that several high anger participants retain as the core of their anger deeply held resentment and anger towards parents who had shamed them. Lack of guilt and shame display, by parents, serves to perpetuate participants' view of themselves as still only worthy of the contempt shown to them as children by their parents. The results show in striking fashion, the effect on participants, both when they have experienced a shaming parent's apology, and when they have actively tried to elicit an apology from parents but have failed. Anthony experienced his mother's shame over her abandoning him. The feeling is described as profound, wonderful, and magical. Angus also describes his father's apology as having a profound effect on him.

Albert on the other hand had approached his mother wanting to share with her his perspective on his childhood. He was rebuffed, and although he appears to be striving to take responsibility for his feelings, his bitterness towards his mother spills into the interview. Andrew also states that in order for him to lose his anger, his father would have to show him that he was ashamed of how he treated the family.

Donald Nathanson's (1992) compass of shame proved a very useful tool for exploring the relationship between shame and anger, for various reasons. On one level it provides a useful framework within which to examine very general, characteristic patterns of behavior, which in other formulations might not be related to shame. This was found to be particularly useful within the high shame/anger group, where behavior formed a

relatively uniform pattern. It was relatively easy to match behavior of participants with Nathanson's categories, especially because their behavior was so exaggerated and idiosyncratic.

Conclusion

This study sought to explore the relationship between shame and anger. This was done using two groups of men (study group=high anger and control group=normal anger) with an average age of 39 years. Semi-structured interviews were given, in which participants were asked about their experiences of both shame and anger. The aim of the study was to try and understand the role that shame plays in relation to anger, across different domains, and in specific reference to high-anger individuals.

Paradoxically, shame appears to be an emotion that can give rise to anger, but it can also attenuate it in certain circumstances. These two emotions were found to interact in a variety of ways, but it was also found that there were patterns, which appeared to be constant across individuals. As a felt emotion, shame does not appear to give rise to anger. Emotionally, shame closes the system down, and so is unlikely in this context to invoke anger. There is also a logic saying that in order for people to feel shame for a transgression, they must first acknowledge that the transgression has occurred, and they must judge themselves responsible for it. If anger is felt in this context, it is likely to be anger at the self.

The results have shown that within the high-anger group that has been studied, shame, as a significant emotional experience, may in fact be an infrequent occurrence. However, when it is experienced it is vividly remembered as painful and debilitating. In this context shame has a profound effect, which appears to prime the individual for change. That is, shame appears to have offered these high-anger individuals an opportunity, which, when taken, may lead to a reduction of anger. Conversely it may lead to an intensification of shame modulating scripts, and a perpetuation of shame-anger.

Shame may be conceptualized in many ways, which makes it extremely difficult to study, especially in relation to other emotions. This was found to be the case in the present

study. When shame is used to describe a pattern of negative self-reference, then its social role changes. Shame in this context may have nothing at all to do with transgression, but rather be a reaction to the perception of oneself as defective. In this way it hinders social relating, because it forces one who experiences it to hide. It is rather like an apology for the self by the self. It is unlikely that chronic anger is associated with this kind of shame because it is internally generated, that is, the self sees the self as shameworthy.

It is thought here that shame-anger results principally from social rejection. When rejection has come from a parent, then anger will likely be intense and deep-seated. The results from this study indicate that the most salient anger-causing factor is rejection by a parent. It is thought by the researcher that to desire and seek love from a parent, and, in return, to be regarded with contempt by that parent is at the core of parental rejection. It is thought that anger is both a reaction to this, as well as a protection mechanism for a shamed self.

Shame does not in all circumstances give rise to anger, nor does anger always result in shame. The relationship between shame and anger can reasonably be described as dynamic. Not only does the direction of influence appear to go two ways, but it also changes over time. In this sense anger and shame may influence each other in different ways at different stages of life.

The current study examined attribution as the mechanism that is thought to mediate the formation of the shame-anger relationship. Although attributions are implied in the shame-anger relationship across the life span, cognitive limitations, particular to childhood, are likely to give rise to a shame-anger configuration that reflects these limitations. For example, the ascription of simplistic causes is thought to be a characteristic of childhood thought. It is possible that patterns of attribution, such as feeling bad about oneself as the result of a parent's shaming, will, in the absence of alternative information, remain fixed across time. This appears to be the case with the high-anger individuals studied.

Is it then the absence of alternative information that enables negative attributional styles to endure, and if so, what is the nature of this information? For example, is it conceptual information that impacts on self-structures (e.g., can be conveyed through education), or, is the information necessary to change these structures emotional in nature. That is, can a sense of self that is damaged by negative attributions, be modified through

words and understanding alone (that is without an emotional component), or is change reliant on intervention at the emotional level? The distinction here is between how one thinks about oneself (knowledge), and how one feels about oneself (emotion).

A very interesting finding of the study was the way in which shame-anger appears to interact within the process of atonement. It was proposed that high-anger individuals might benefit greatly through a conciliatory approach by a shaming parent. This appears to be a situation in which self-structures are modified by emotional information, in the sense that by experiencing their parents apology, participants gained the opportunity to not only understand their parents, but to forgive them as well. The data suggests that an essential precursor to forgiveness is witnessing their parents' expression of shame. An interesting area of future exploration could be to examine the meaning that individuals ascribe to expressions of shame in others within an atonement context. Is it the shame component of an apology that enables the process of forgiveness to be carried to its deepest level? Furthermore, the area of whether expressions of atonement have an impact at the level of attribution also needs to be explored in order to understand the mechanisms, which are capable of reducing chronic anger?

Reflections about thoughts and feelings can at least be garnered directly from those directly involved in shame-anger situations, and as can be seen by the diversity of shame-anger situations, there is much work to be done on the level of conceptualization. Shame-anger is capable of being both internally and externally elicited. The current study has tended to focus on the internal generation of shame anger. The question of how this actually happens, the dynamics of the process, is an area that requires further research and theorizing.

In order to research this, the relationship between shame and the self needs to be explored on an empirical level. The current study used a single interview method, and examined in reasonable detail aspects of selfhood relating to shame. However, this is a difficult area to delve into, and there is naturally much resistance. Future research might make use of a multi-interview method, wherein the interviews are structured in such a way as to gradually enter the relevant level of enquiry. Relevant information would not so much concern the structures of the self, as the way in which self-structures interact. To this end, a more differentiated concept of shame seems to be required. For example, the two groups

studied embodied different aspects of shame. The moral psychology of the high-anger individuals studied is oriented towards the world in highly codified expressions of ability, competence, power, and strength. Therefore, this configuration is emphasized within the experience of shame for this group.

In contrast, the moral psychology of the control group tended towards empathy, issues of fairness and equality, and shame tended to be experienced in relation these categories. Although they are part of the same self-structure, the idea that anger is based on a qualitatively different form of shame for both groups needs to be further explored.

Bibliography

- Averill, J. R. (1982). *Anger and Aggression: An Essay on Emotion*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and Loss*, Vol. 2 Separation: Anxiety and Anger. London: The Hogarth Press
- Brenner, M. (1985). Intensive Interviewing. In M. Brenner, J. Brown, D. Canter (Eds.), *The Research Interview: Uses and Approaches* (pp. 147-161).
- Buss, A. H. (1961). *The Psychology of Aggression*. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Coffey, A., Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making Sense of Qualitative Data: Complementary Research Strategies*. London: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Dutton, D. (1998). *The Abusive Personality: Violence and Control in Intimate Relationships*. New York Guilford Press.
- Flick, U. (1998). *An Introduction To Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publications
- Gilbert, P., 1998). Preface. In P. Gilbert, & B. Andrews (Eds.), *Shame: Interpersonal Behavior, Psychopathology, and Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harre, R., & Parrot, W. G. (1996). *The Emotions: Social, Cultural and Biological Dimensions*. London: Sage Publications.
- Harris, P. L., & Saarni, C. (1989). Introduction. In C. Saarni, & P. L. Harris (Eds.), *Children's Understanding of Emotion* (pp. 3-24). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hayes, N. (1997). Theory-Led Thematic Analysis: Social Identification in Small Companies. In N. Hayes (Ed.). *Doing Qualitative Analysis in Psychology* pp. 93-114. East Sussex: Psychology Press.
- Izard, C. E. (1977). *Human Emotions*. New York: Plenum
- Keltner, D. & Harker, L. (1998). The Forms and Functions of the Nonverbal Signal of Shame. In P. Gilbert, & B. Andrews (Eds.). *Shame: Interpersonal Behavior, Psychopathology, and Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kirschenbaum, H., & Henderson, V. L. (1986). *The Carl Rogers Reader*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1991). *Emotion and Adaptation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lewis, M. (1992). *Shame: The Exposed Self*. New York: The Free Press

- Lieberman, M. S. (1986). Affect and Humanistic Moral Judgment. In G. L. Sapp (Ed.), *Handbook of Moral Judgment* (pp. 234-248). Birmingham, Alabama: Religious Education Press.
- Magai, C., Distal, N., & Liker, R. (1995). Emotion Socialization, Attachment, and Patterns of Adult Emotional Traits. *Cognition And Emotion*, 9 (5), 461-481.
- McCracken, G. (1988). *The Long Interview*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publication Inc.
- Miller, S. (1996). *Shame in Context*. Hillsdale, New Jersey. London: The Analytic Press.
- Miller, W. I. (1993). *Humiliation*. London: Cornell University Press
- Nathanson, D. L. (1992). *Shame and Pride: Affect, Sex, and The Birth of The Self*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Oosterwegel, A., & Oppenheimer, L. (1993). *The Self-System: Developmental Changes Between and Within Self-Concepts*. New Jersey: Earlbaum.
- Ornstein, P. H. (1999). Conceptualization and Treatment of Rage in Self Psychology. *Journal of Clinical Psychology: In Session*. 55 (3), 283-293.
- Paivio, S. C. (1999). Experiential Conception and Treatment of Anger. In *Journal of Clinical Psychology: In Session*. 55 (3), 311-324.
- Pattison, S. (2000). *Shame: Theory, Therapy, Theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Piaget, J. (1932). *The Moral Judgment of The Child*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Tangney, J. P., Wagner, P., Hill-Barlow, D., Marschall, D. E., & Gramzow, R. (1996). Relation of Shame and Guilt to Constructive Versus Destructive Responses to Anger Across The Lifespan. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70 (4), 797-809.
- Taylor, S. J., & Bogdan, R. (1998). *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods: A Guidebook and Resource (3rd ed.)*. U S A: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Scheff, T. J. (1997). *Emotions, The Social Bond, and Human Reality: Part/Whole Analysis*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Stein, N. L., & Trabasso, T. (1989). Children's Understanding of Changing Emotional States. In C. Saarni, & P. L. Harris (Eds.), *Children's Understanding of Emotion* pp. 3-24. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Strongman, K. T. (1996). *The Psychology of Emotion: Theories of Emotion in Perspective* (4th ed). England: John Wiley & Sons.

Tantum, D. (1998). The Emotional Disorders of Shame. In P. Gilbert, & B. Andrews (Eds.). *Shame: Interpersonal Behavior, Psychopathology, and Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Thompson, R. A. (1989). Causal Attributions and Children's Emotional Understanding. In C. Saarni, & P. L. Harris (Eds.), *Children's Understanding of Emotion* (pp. 3-24). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tomkins, S. (1995). *Shame and Its Sisters: A Silvan Tomkins Reader*. In E. K. Sedgwick, & A. Frank (Eds.), Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Willig, C. (2001). *Introducing Qualitative Research in Psychology: Adventures in Theory and Method*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Appendix

Interview Schedule

Areas covered:

Childhood

- family situation
- relationship to parents
- own experience as a child
- mood of the home environment
- own mood – anger – shame
- how others saw participant
- how participant saw others
- how participant felt about themselves
- discipline in family

Adolescence

- family situation
- self thoughts and feelings
- how participant related to family and vice versa
- anger – shame during adolescence
- left home
- education
- what participant thought parents wanted for them

Adulthood

- thoughts and feelings about self
- relationships
- shame and anger during adulthood
- motivations for doing things – work
- what participant wanted for self
- life changes-explore in depth where relevant to topic